clerk, with support from the State Court Administrator. This project, funded by Federal Justice Assistance Act funds, is currently developing time standards for all categories of cases. These time standards will allow judges, attorneys, and most important, ligitants to know how long their case should take and when they can expect a final ruling. Hopefully, for most civil cases this time will be a year or less rather than the present as much as three or four years in some places. The implementation of these time standards will be possible only through the increased use of caseflow management programs, increased training of judges and court personnel, increased analysis and monitoring of caseloads, and improvement in data processing in the trial courts.

The first goal of case processing is supported by at least two important functions. The first, the Michigan Judicial Institute, is under the supervision of Justice Michael F. Cavanagh and is directed by Dennis Catlin. The MJI, as we call it, was honored recently by a national conference of special trial court judges for having the best judicial education program in the United States. The MJI will support the improved case processing program by special training of both judges and administrative personnel.

The second support function is the Judicial Data Center which is under the supervision of State Court Administrator, V. Robert Payant and the Judicial Data Center Chief, Richard Wilhelm. We would hope within the reasonable future to have about five circuit courts, ten probate courts and thirty-five district courts on-line. All of the probate courts are on the batch computer system. While all courts may not benefit from computerization, most would, and this would greatly facilitate the improved processing program.

In response to the second challenge, that is, to improve public service and understanding of the court system, our immediate goal is to find out what the public properly wants from its courts and then to develop ways to satisfy those wants. Several initiatives are underway. Under the supervision of Justice Patricia J. Boyle, a blue ribbon Citizens' Commission to Improve Michigan's Courts has been established. The men and women of the Commission represent citizens throughout the State and bring enthusiasm and creativity to bear on the problems facing our courts. We anticipate recommendations from the Commission in early fall and will be sharing those with you. We can then determine what best each of us can do. We feel this is an area where significant contributions can be made in the administration of justice and that the citizens working with Justice Boyle will leave no stone unturned to come up with the best and most useful programs.

The Judiciary has initiated several programs designed to increase service to and facilitate better understanding by the public. Among these programs is the Sentencing Guidelines Program, operating under the supervision of Supervising Justice Michael F. Cavanagh. Last year I reported to you a significant reduction in sentence disparity. An additional year of experience with the guidelines verifies a reduction in sentence disparity based on race, gender, whether the defendant exercised the constitutional right to trial, and whether the defendant relied on appointed counsel. Further, 82.4 percent of all sentences statewide were within the ranges recommended in the guidelines.

The committee has recommended some changes to improve the guidelines by adjusting some of the variables and possibly the guideline ranges. The Supreme Court intends to publish these suggested revisions for comment in order that all who are interested may contribute. We will continue to work with you to improve the guidelines.

In the criminal justice area one of the continuing problems is the best method of providing the constitutionally required assigned counsel to indigent defendants. Several years ago, the Legislature established the State Appellate Defender's Office which has provided superior legal services both to individual defendants and to practicing defense attorneys at a very modest cost per case. More recently you have instituted the Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System to guarantee that other assigned appellate counsel be appropriately competent. There remains the matter of assigned trial counsel. All of this involves proper selection, proper payment, etc. This is a very intricate and complex field that has challenged the administration of justice for a number of years. To work with the legislatively established agencies, the judges, and the lawyers of this State on this problem, the court has designated Justice Charles L. Levin who has already given of his time and talents in this area as Supervising Justice.

The third challenge is to carry out the constitutional mandate of "One Court of Justice" and to guarantee each citizen in every part of the State access to courts with adequate resources and personnel. In 1980, this body recognized and began the realization of this constitutional mandate. You adopted and began the implementation of the principle of equal justice for all Michigan citizens with a plan for replacement of local dollars with state funding of courts. That plan, if implemented under the five-year schedule called for then, would be substantially completed today. With the State's economic difficulties in the early 1980's, this implementation has been delayed.

Our goal today in this area is to achieve what your 1980 legislation promised. To lead us in this area we have designated Justice James H. Brickley as Supervisory Justice because of his executive and local government background.

Since this body first funded three Wayne County courts in 1981, and promised to fund the rest of the courts in the State during the ensuing five years, several changes have occurred. The relationship between trial courts and their local funding units has changed substantially. Funding units previously disinterested in state assistance for trial courts are now faced with adverse financial circumstances and many are most interested in our 1986 program of state funding. Disputes between courts and funding units over the proper level of funding have sprung up all around the State. Some of these disputes have even resulted in lawsuits. In December, 1985, the Supreme Court implemented, through an administrative order arising out of the Hillsdale-Cheboygan case, a procedure to be followed to try to resolve these disputes at the earliest possible time. Through the intervention of the State Court Administrative Office and the voluntary services of both judges and county commissioners as mediators, some of these disputes have been resolved. But the underlying problem -- lack of adequate funding for court services -- remains. The need for state funding is today more urgent than ever.

Your concern as a Legislator is the same as mine as a Justice: that is to establish the same norm of justice everywhere in Michigan. When you write a statute prohibiting a criminal act or defining a civil act, you assume, and rightfully so, that the statute will be enforced in the same way in Monroe and Marquette. By definition, state statutes are to be centrally established by the Legislature and evenly applied. To permit local government to impose its own concept of the administration of justice would be to undermine the constitutional basis of the Legislature.

This year our budget request contains a new concept. In prior years we requested a percentage of the total trial court operations be funded. This year we have abandoned that heretofore unsuccessful approach and ask you to look with us at essential services -- most mandated by the federal and state constitutions -- which trial courts must provide. These services include assigned trial and appellate counsel, juror fees, witness fees, transcripts on appeal, court reporting and Judicial Data Center user fees. In addition, we support the next step in judicial standardization payments, and an enhancement to the judicial retirement system to put it on a par with other state operated systems. This total package equates to $29 million for a full year's funding. We urge you to explore what this funding would mean to the operation of the courts in your district and to a more uniform system of justice throughout Michigan.

After the Judiciary had formulated its three point program to improve the Michigan court system during 1986-87, it became apparent that the public, the Legislature and Executive, and even the Judiciary itself, was giving high priority to another area. That area was family and children services.

For example, the Legislature this year passed the Family Equity Package to improve the collection of support payments for children of separated or divorced parents. This is a laudable achievement. Further, your interest in and support to the State Court Administrative Office, in the development of equitable child support guidelines, assures that the final product will be one which serves Michigan's children well. We welcome your continuing involvement in this program.

Two years ago Dr. M. Agnes Mansour and I established an ongoing cooperative program between the Judiciary and the Department of Social Services to review programs for which we had joint or at least contiguous responsibilities. To date, joint task forces have explored foster home certification, adult services, friend of the court programs, and data management. Even still, we have but scratched the surface of the issues involved.

To probe further the complexity of the courts' services to families and children, Justice Dorothy Comstock Riley will be spearheading a task force to explore the depth and breadth of these issues. Like you, Justice Riley's task force will be reviewing the recommendations of the Coleman Commission, permanency planning proposals, etc., as well as communicating with judges, representatives of the Michigan Department of Social Services, private agencies, and users of the services. The overriding goal of the task force will be to determine how necessary services to children and families can be provided in the most effective manner. Your suggestions are surely welcome.

In effect, we have added a fourth, and a very important and basic point to our three point program to improve the Michigan court system.

What I have just described is the Judiciary's program: first, improved case processing; second, a user-friendly court; and third, state funding plus the newly coordinated family and children services program as a fourth point. Together, these four points constitute the Judiciary's comprehensive strategy to do all it can by itself to restore the balance between the government's three independent powers so as to give the people of this State the democracy and effective government their Constitution promises them. But obviously, in our system of independent but coordinated branches of government power, no one branch can do it all by itself. All three branches must work together if the people are to be well served.

What I ask, then, is that the Legislature and the Executive give the Judiciary a hand to become as well equipped, as they are, to serve, as well as they do, the people of this State. After all, that is the constitutional mission of all three branches, together to give Michigan citizens the best government of which our tripartite system of independent powers is capable.

The help the Judiciary needs from the Legislature and the Executive is to strengthen the State Court Administrative Office's support of the trial courts, to further fund the Judicial Data Center so as to improve the state court computer network and to further implement the program of state funding trial courts.

As I told the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the Court is generally pleased with the Governor's recommendations. While the Governor cut our request, we think we can live with the cuts with the following exceptions, all of which was detailed to the Committee. The Governor cut our requst by 15 positions. We can make do presently without nine of them, but six of the fifteen are immediately essential to our program to improve the Michigan court system. Likewise, the failure to subsidize user fees for the use of trial court computers will crimp the Judiciary's ability to eliminate trial delay.

Finally, the complete elimination of any funding to implement the next step in state funding of trial courts is a serious set-back. It is understandable that, perhaps, the whole $29 million for the first step will not be available this year. However, let me call to your attention that the Governor in his printed message recognized that state funding "would enable our court system to operate more efficiently and reduce the pressure on local property taxes." The Governor, however, though approving state financing in principle, said this year's "hold-the-line budget doesn't permit us to act on this proposal this year." May I suggest you and he give serious consideration to at least a modest beginning of this budget year.

Again, thank you for the honor of permitting me to address you and for your kind attention.

WRITTEN APPENDIX TO ORAL MESSAGE

I. CASE DISPOSITION

SUPREME COURT

Thanks to an increase in staff support approved by the Legislature several years ago, the Michigan Supreme Court has fewer cases pending than at any time since 1980.

The Supreme Court had a total of 1,165 cases pending on June 30th of last year compared to 1,407 on the same date the previous year and 1,648 cases that were pending on June 30, 1982.

In a little more than 60 days, we'll be closing the books on our 1985-86 year and it appears we may have fewer than 1,000 cases pending then.

The Supreme Court has been able to reduce the number of cases pending despite the fact that the number of new cases filed annually has more than quadrupled since 1970.

The number of new cases filed with the Supreme Court during the twelve months ending last June 30 totaled 2,072 compared to 2,352 the previous year, a decline of 280 filings. This is only the third time since 1970 in which new case filings were fewer than the previous year. We believe the drop in new case filings is only temporary. The Michigan Court of Appeals, which had a drop of 440 cases in 1984, had a sharp increase in new cases during 1985, which will probably soon result in increased applications to our Court.

The Michigan Supreme Court had a banner year for calendar 1985 in terms of the amount of time it took to issue opinions after the Court had heard oral arguments on its cases.

The Court took an average of seven and one-half months to reach a decision on all of its 1985 cases after hearing oral arguments presented by attorneys in each case. During the previous decade, the time between arguments and decision had averaged twelve months.

We are working hard to reach decisions and issue opinions in a more timely manner, just as we are asking trial courts throughout the State to reduce delay in the cases they hear.

COURT OF APPEALS

During 1985, a record 7,436 new cases were filed in the Michigan Court of Appeals, an increase of 882 or 13.5 percent compared to the previous year.

During the same period, the Appeal Court disposed of 6,386 cases, a decline of three percent compared to 1984.

The increase in new cases demonstrates, once again, the need for additional Court

of Appeals judges. Last year, 65 circuit court and Recorder's Court judges were assigned temporarily to the Court of Appeals so that it could operate with eight instead of six panels throughout the year. The need for three additional Court of Appeals judges is becoming critical.

TRIAL COURTS

For the first time we have reports from each of the 241 trial courts regarding the new cases filed during the calendar year, and we can make some comparisons of the 1985 data with previous years.

For the circuit courts and Recorder's Court, rounded to the nearest thousand, there were a total of 188,000 new cases filed during 1985 contrasted with 186,000 in 1984, an increase of slightly over one percent.

Nearly 24,000 circuit court cases are reported as being more than two years old, down nearly 10 percent from 1984. Although a good start, it is to those cases, primarily civil matters, that the first phase of the caseflow management project is addressed.

Probate courts had a total of 127,000 new filings in 1985 compared to 123,000 during the prior year, an increase of three percent.

In the juvenile division of the probate courts, 35,000 formal petitions on delinquency were accepted and 6,500 on neglect and abuse during 1985, an increase in each category.

The district courts and remaining municipal courts, including their traffic matters and small claims cases, report a total of 2,400,000 new cases last year compared to 2,290,000 in 1984, for an increase of five percent.

That means that the trial court system during 1985 docketed a total of 2,756,500 new cases of all types. This represents a four percent increase over new case filings in 1984.

Disposition data is still being analyzed but would indicate that the courts disposed of more cases in 1985 than in 1984. However, the year-end inventory of cases shows an increase due to the greater number of filings.

Part of the Court's program to improve the Michigan court system involves improving case management information systems for the trial courts. It continues to be a major concern of the Supreme Court that the trial courts be assisted in developing systems that will permit them to monitor their workloads and make complete statistical reports, including case filings, case dispositions, pending cases, and case age.

One current effort of the Legislature, legislation which would permit the conversion of the 17 remaining part-time probate judges to full-time, would provide for additional judicial resources to deal with the increasing caseloads of the trial courts as well as eliminate the possibility of conflict of interest.

II. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HIRING

The Supreme Court recognizes and supports the state policy of equal opportunity employment. The Michigan Supreme Court and the State Court Administrative Office have a total of 182 employees in Lansing, Detroit, Mt. Pleasant, and Traverse City.

Of our 182 employees, 28 or 15.4 percent are black or hispanic. Statewide, Michigan has a minority population of fifteen percent. Our minority employees include two Supreme Court commissioners, four administrators, nine analysts, the Court Crier and Deputy Crier, three law clerks, five secretaries, one clerk, and two custodians.

Seventy-six or 41.8 percent of our employees are male and 106 or 58.2 percent are female. Statewide, Michigan's population is made up of 48.8 percent males and 51.2 percent female. Of the 106 female employees, 60 or 56.6 percent are professionals and 46 are non-professionals. The professionals include two Supreme Court comissioners, one deputy court clerk, one assistant court clerk, one executive assistant to the Chief Justice, sixteen law clerks, six administrative assistants, twelve legal secretaries, one judicial education program administrator, two education program managers, four court analysts, one budget analyst, three field service representatives, one scheduling coordinator, one Assigned Appellate Counsel administrator, one court consultant, four programmer analysts, one docket control manager, and two docket analysts.

III. BAR AND BENCH

The Supreme Court continued its "outreach" program to the Bench and Bar in 1985. The full Court met with chief judges of all trial courts in June to review the issue of trial court delay. Several exemplary programs in Michigan courts were cited and judges whose courts are running most efficiently shared their "trade secrets" with the chief judges who are responsible for the operation of the trial courts.

In addition to meeting with judges and attorneys in regional meetings, the practice of conferring with each of the judges' associations and the State Bar on a quarterly basis was continued. Through this mechanism the entire legal community has the opportunity to discuss issues before they escalate to crisis proportions and often these interactions lead to early resolution of problems. One area of particular concern to judges which was focused through this medium is the judicial liability issue. Through the joint efforts of the judges' associations and the State Bar, an agreement was reached whereby the Attorney General will defend judges and court personnel in causes of action arising out of their official duties. Although the corollary issue of indemnification has not been thoroughly tested, the Attorney General has offered to pursue this issue as it arises with clarifying legislation as an ultimate goal.

As the Michigan economy continues to improve and spread to far corners of the world, the necessity for a highly efficient court system is required. To assist in economic development, the Court in 1985 adopted a court rule to allow foreign legal counsel to be admitted to the Michigan Bar for limited purposes. It is envisioned

that this rule change will be helpful to foreign corporations and persons wishing to do business with Michigan and, thus, encourage international trade.

IV. PRISON AND JAIL SPACE

Last year, because the Judiciary was under pressure to set inadequate bail or sentence too lightly, because of jail and prison overcrowding, I felt compelled to bring this situation to the attention of the Legislature. In this year's State of the State Message, the Governor indicates that because of your efforts, prison and jail overcrowding has been reduced. I am happy to report that no undue pressure on the Judiciary has been felt as in former years but that the margin of safety unfortunately is not yet reassuring.

V. COURT FACILITIES

The necessity of adequate court facilities continues to be a problem from the Supreme Court to the District Court throughout the State. As the economy recovered, there have been improvements in facilities in several communities and many more are in the planning stage to be completed in the near future.

At the state level, however, we continue to be separated in the Law Building, a State office building, and rented space for the Supreme Court, its staff, the State Court Administrative Office, and the Court of Appeals. As you consider proposals for revitalizing downtown Lansing, be mindful of this continuing need. Once again, we have asked you for consideration of a feasibility study for this purpose in our budget request and urge your favorable action.

ANNUAL REPORT

Supreme Court

Summary Status Report

I. CASELOAD, QUANTITATIVE REPORT, 15-YEAR PERIOD, YEARS ENDING ON 6/30

YEAR	CASES FILED	CASES COMPLETED	CASES PENDING
85	2,072	2,314	1,165
84	2,352	2,495	1,407
83	2,112	2,224	1,536
82	2,083	1,813	1,648
81	1,949	1,713	1,378
80	1,850	1,517	1,142
79	1,470	1,508	812
78	1,636	1,487	850
77	1,227	1,145	697
76	991	1,060	615
75	974	786	518
74	957	879	411
73	811	654	410
72	658	693	201
71	708	761	310

The year ending June 30, 1985 is the third since 1970 in which new case filings were fewer than in the year before. This brief pause in what had been a steady rate of increase in filings combined with a continued high number of case completions to cause the number of cases pending to decline for the third consecutive year. That number, 1,165, is the lowest since 1980.

II. CASE DISPOSITIONS, 10-YEAR PERIOD, YEARS ENDING ON 6/30

Case dispositions, those events which in individual cases conclude the Court's work and end its jurisdiction, are of four types which may be described as follows:

A. Opinion - Either following a grant of leave or in response to an application for leave to appeal, the Court may release a formal opinion disposing of the case.

B. Final Order Without Opinion - The Court may summarily grant relief or remand a case for further proceedings by an order without the time-consuming process of briefing, oral argument and opinion writing.

C. Denial Of Leave To Appeal - Because the Constitution vests the Supreme Court with the discretion to review decisions of lower courts, the Court may simply deny applications for leave to appeal.

D. Dismissal Or Withdrawal - A case may be withdrawn by agreement of the parties or, very rarely, dismissed by the Court on motion charging failure to diligently pursue an appeal.

The numbers of such dispositions and their percentages of the totals for the last ten years are:

YEAR	TOTAL OF CASES COMPLETED (A+B+C+D)	A. COMPLETED BY OPINIONS	B. COMPLETED BY FINAL ORDERS WITHOUT OPINIONS	C. COMPLETED BY DENIALS OF LEAVE TO APPEAL	D. COMPLETED BY DISMISSALS AND WITHDRAWALS
85	2,314	135 (5.8%)	218 (9.4%)	1,889 (81.6%)	72 (3.2%)
84	2,495	70 (2.8%)	327 (13.1%)	2,041 (81.8%)	57 (2.3%)
83	2,224	134 (6.1%)	200 (9.0%)	1,831 (82.3%)	59 (2.6%)
82	1,813	104 (5.7%)	226 (12.5%)	1,438 (79.3%)	45 (2.5%)
81	1,713	80 (4.6%)	249 (14.5%)	1,342 (78.3%)	42 (2.4%)
80	1,517	114 (7.5%)	205 (13.5%)	1,179 (77.7%)	19 (1.3%)
79	1,508	127 (9.1%)	175 (11.6%)	1,161 (76.9%)	34 (2.2%)
78	1,487	96 (6.4%)	130 (8.7%)	1,230 (82.7%)	31 (2.0%)
77	1,145	129 (11.2%)	103 (8.9%)	889 (77.6%)	24 (2.0%)
76	1,060	135 (12.7%)	166 (15.6%)	733 (69.1%)	26 (2.4%)

III. TYPES OF CASE FILINGS

	1983	1984	1985
APPLICATION FOR LEAVE AND PRISONERS' LETTER REQUESTS FOR REVIEW	2,028 (96%)	2,250 (96%)	1,974 (95%)
APPLICATIONS PRIOR TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION	14	25	13
APPLICATIONS FROM ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD	16	16	13
MANDAMUS/SUPERINTENDING CONTROL -- ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION/ BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS	37	40	38
JUDICIAL TENURE COMMISSION CASES	5	5	3
CERTIFIED QUESTIONS FROM FEDERAL COURTS	5	1	4
REQUESTS FOR ADVISORY OPINIONS/ EXECUTIVE MESSAGE	1	1	0
FOREIGN ATTORNEY ADMISSION CASES	5	6	1
QUO WARRANTO PROCEEDING	1	0	0
CERTIFIED COURT OF APPEALS CONFLICTS	0	8	26
SUBTOTAL	84 (4%)	102 (4%)	98 (5%)
TOTALS	2,112	2,352	2,072

	1983	1984	1985
CIVIL CASES FILED	1,111 (53%)	1,080 (46%)	984 (47%)
CRIMINAL CASES FILED	1,001 (47%)	1,272 (54%)	1,088 (53%)

IV. MOTIONS AND OTHER SEPARATE ORDERS

Motion Dispositions

During the year ended June 30, 1985, the Court issued 642 separate additional orders on motion matters as follows: 125 orders granting leave to appeal; 34 orders on motions for rehearing; 123 orders on motions for reconsideration; 7 corrective orders issued on the Court's own motions; 108 orders holding cases in abeyance, issued on the Courts own motions; 70 miscellaneous orders on motions for bail, for stay of proceedings, to tax or not tax costs, etc.; 130 orders issued by the Chief Justice, here commonly called "housekeeping orders", e.g., orders on motions to extend the time for filing briefs to place on or withdraw a case from a session calendar, or for oral argument, etc., 21 orders to show cause and 24 orders on motions for admission to the bar. In addition to these 642 separate orders on motions there are now each year over 1,000 motions acted upon by the Court where those actions are included within the final order issued which completes the Court's work on the case.

Grants Of Leave To Appeal

Orders granting leave to appeal notify the parties that formal review of the case will be undertaken. Grant orders and their percentage relationship to new filings in the same year for the past ten years are as follows:

YEAR	NUMBER OF GRANTS	AS PERCENTAGE OF NEW FILINGS
1985	125	6.0%
1984	95	4.0%
1983	138	6.5%
1982	54	2.6%
1981	98	5.0%
1980	84	4.5%
1979	55	3.7%
1978	92	5.6%
1977	110	8.9%
1976	121	12.2%

V. ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

The Court's constitutional responsibility for "general superintending control over all courts" requires it to meet on a regular basis to consider court rules and other matters relating to the administration of the court system. In the year just ended, the Court met on administrative matters on 26 occasions and acted upon 104 agenda items including the final adoption of the Michigan Court Rules of 1985, appointments to committees, boards and commissions, review of local court rules and administrative orders and the internal procedures of the Court. Those actions resulted in the issuance of 27 court orders which included Court Rules changes and appointments.

Court of Appeals

The Constitution
State of Michigan
Article VI Sec. 8

"The court of appeals shall consist initially of nine judges who shall be nominated and elected at non-partisan elections from districts drawn on county lines and as nearly as possible of equal population, as provided by law. The supreme court may prescribe by rule that the court of appeals sit in divisions and for the terms of court and the times and places thereof. Each such division shall consist of not fewer than three judges. The number of judges comprising the court of appeals may be increased, and the districts from which they are elected may be changed by law."

Legend

I	1st District - Detroit	
II	2nd District - Lansing	Judgeships
III	3rd District - Grand Rapids	18

December, 1985

COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES

Danhof, Robert J.
Chief Judge

Allen, Glenn S., Jr.

Beasley, William R.

Brennan, Vincent J.

Bronson, S. Jerome

Burns, Robert B.

Burns, Thomas M.

Cynar, Walter P.

Gillis, John H.

Gribbs, Roman S.

Holbrook, Donald E., Jr.

Hood, Harold

Kelly, Michael J.

MacKenzie, Barbara B.

Maher, Richard M.

Shepherd, John H.

Wahls, Myron H.

Walsh, Daniel F.

ANNUAL REPORT

Court of Appeals

Summary of Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

I. ANNUAL FILINGS IN COURT OF APPEALS

CALENDAR YEAR	TOTAL FILINGS	NUMERICAL CHANGE	PERCENTAGE CHANGE
1965*	1,235		
1966	1,475	240	19.4%
1967	1,795	320	21.7%
1968	1,894	99	5.5%
1969**	1,959	65	3.4%
1970	2,214	255	13.0%
1971	2,336	122	5.5%
1972	2,799	463	19.8%
1973	3,076	277	9.8%
1974	3,579	503	16.4%
1975***	4,435	856	23.9%
1976	4,544	109	2.5%
1977	5,274	730	16.0%
1978	5,248	- 26	- 0.5%
1979	5,499	251	5.0%
1980	5,980	481	8.8%
1981	6,318	338	5.7%
1982	6,911	593	9.4%
1983	6,994	83	1.2%
1984	6,554	-440	- 6.3%
1985	7,436	882	13.5%

1965 to 1985 Increase = 6,201 or 502%

1985 Filings per Judge = 413

* Nine judges at inception
** Three judges added
*** Six judges added

II. ANNUAL DISPOSITIONS IN COURT OF APPEALS

CALENDAR YEAR	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	NUMERICAL CHANGE	PERCENTAGE CHANGE
1965*	642		
1966	1,250	608	95%
1967	1,375	125	10%
1968	1,712	337	25%
1969**	1,884	172	10%
1970	2,133	249	13%
1971	2,334	201	9%
1972	2,459	125	5%
1973	2,950	491	20%
1974	2,824	-126	- 4%
1975***	3,503	679	24%
1976	4,584	1,081	31%
1977	4,788	204	4%
1978	4,937	149	3%
1979	5,159	222	4%
1980	5,193	34	1%
1981	5,977	784	15%
1982	5,946	- 31	- 1%
1983	6,690	744	13%
1984	6,605	- 85	- 1%
1985	6,386	-219	- 3%

1965 to 1985 Increase = 5,136 or 411%

Maximum Workload Achieved in 1983: Opinions = 3,791 - 23 = 164.8
Orders = 2,899 - 18 = 161
Total Workload per Judge = 325.8

* Nine judges at inception
** Three judges added
*** Six judges added

CIRCUIT COURT

The Constitution
State of Michigan
Article VI Sec. 11

"The state shall be divided into judicial circuits along county lines in each of which there shall be elected one or more circuit judges as provided by law. Sessions of the circuit court shall be held at least four times in each year in every county organized for judicial purposes. Each circuit judge shall hold court in the county or counties within the circuit in which he is elected, and in other circuits as may be provided by rules of the supreme court. The number of judges shall be changed and circuits shall be created, altered and discontinued on recommendation of the supreme court to reflect changes in judicial activity. No change in the number of judges or alteration or discontinuance of a circuit shall have the effect of removing a judge from office during his term."

Legend

1 - Circuit Number
(3) - Number Circuit Judgeships

Number of Circuit Courts
55

Judgeships
167

December, 1985

CIRCUIT AND RECORDER'S COURT JUDGES

Includes Former Judges

1st Circuit Court	Moes, Harvey W.
2nd Circuit Court	Burkholz, Zoe S.
2nd Circuit Court	Hughes, Julian E.
2nd Circuit Court	Taylor, Ronald J.
2nd Circuit Court	White, William S.
3rd Circuit Court	Battani, Marianne O.
3rd Circuit Court	Borman, Susan D.
3rd Circuit Court	Bowman, Arthur M.
3rd Circuit Court	Brennan, Thomas J.
3rd Circuit Court	Cahalan, William Leo
3rd Circuit Court	Colombo, Robert J.
3rd Circuit Court	Colombo, Robert J., Jr.
3rd Circuit Court	Connor, Michael J.
3rd Circuit Court	Dingeman, Harry J., Jr.
3rd Circuit Court	Duggan, Patrick J.
3rd Circuit Court	Dunn, Richard D.
3rd Circuit Court	Farmer, Charles S.
3rd Circuit Court	Finch, Sharon Tevis
3rd Circuit Court	Foley, Thomas J.
3rd Circuit Court	Gillis, John H., Jr.
3rd Circuit Court	Giovan, William J.
3rd Circuit Court	Hathaway, James A.
3rd Circuit Court	Hathaway, Richard P.
3rd Circuit Court	Hausner, John H.
3rd Circuit Court	Kaufman, Charles
3rd Circuit Court	Kaufman, Richard C.
3rd Circuit Court	Kirwan, John R.
3rd Circuit Court	Mies, James E.
3rd Circuit Court	Morcom, Claudia House
3rd Circuit Court	Olzark, Roland L.
3rd Circuit Court	Reilly, Maureen Pulte
3rd Circuit Court	Roumell, Thomas
3rd Circuit Court	Simmons, Louis F., Jr.
3rd Circuit Court	Stacey, Michael L.
3rd Circuit Court	Stempien, Marvin R.
3rd Circuit Court	Stephens, Cynthia Diane
3rd Circuit Court	Sullivan, Joseph B.
3rd Circuit Court	Szymanski, Henry J.
3rd Circuit Court	Teranes, Paul S.
3rd Circuit Court	Watts, Lucile A.
3rd Circuit Court	White, Helene Nita
4th Circuit Court	Britten, Gordon W.
4th Circuit Court	Falahee, Charles J.
4th Circuit Court	Fleming, James G.
4th Circuit Court	Noble, Russell E.
5th Circuit Court	Deming, Hudson E.
6th Circuit Court	Shuster, Richard M.
6th Circuit Court	Anderson, Robert C.
6th Circuit Court	Andrews, Steven N.
6th Circuit Court	Breck, David F.
6th Circuit Court	Gage, Hilda R.
6th Circuit Court	Gilbert, Alice L.
6th Circuit Court	Kuhn, Richard D.
6th Circuit Court	LaPlata, George H.
6th Circuit Court	Lippitt, Norman L.
6th Circuit Court	Mester, Fred M.

6th Circuit Court	O'Brien, Francis X.
6th Circuit Court	O'Brien, John N.
6th Circuit Court	Schnelz, Gene
6th Circuit Court	Templin, Robert Lewis, Jr.
6th Circuit Court	Thorburn, James S.
6th Circuit Court	Ziem, Frederick C.
7th Circuit Court	Borradaile, Earl E.
7th Circuit Court	Elliott, Philip C.
7th Circuit Court	Freeman, Donald R.
7th Circuit Court	Fullerton, Judith A.
7th Circuit Court	McAra, Harry B.
7th Circuit Court	Ransom, Robert M.
7th Circuit Court	Yeotis, Thomas C.
8th Circuit Court	Banks, James L.
8th Circuit Court	Simon, Charles W., Jr.
9th Circuit Court	Borsos, Robert L.
9th Circuit Court	Fitzgerald, John E.
9th Circuit Court	Foley, John F.
9th Circuit Court	Lamb, Richard Ryan
9th Circuit Court	Mullen, C. H., Jr.
10th Circuit Court	Borchard, Fred J.
10th Circuit Court	Gilbert, Robert S.
10th Circuit Court	Kaczmarek, Robert L.
10th Circuit Court	McDonald, Gary R.
10th Circuit Court	McDonald, Joseph R.
11th Circuit Court	Hood, William F.
12th Circuit Court	Condon, Stephen D.
13th Circuit Court	Brown, William R.
13th Circuit Court	Forster, Charles M.
14th Circuit Court	Daniels, R. Max
14th Circuit Court	Graves, James M., Jr.
14th Circuit Court	Kobza, Michael Eugene
14th Circuit Court	Pannucci, Ronald H.
15th Circuit Court	Cherry, Michael H.
16th Circuit Court	Bruff, John B.
16th Circuit Court	Cashen, Raymond R.
16th Circuit Court	Chrzanowski, Robert J.
16th Circuit Court	Daner, James C.
16th Circuit Court	Deneweth, George R.
16th Circuit Court	Jansen, Kathleen
16th Circuit Court	Roskopp, John G.
16th Circuit Court	Sanborn, Kenneth N.
16th Circuit Court	Zatkoff, Lawrence P.
17th Circuit Court	Benson, Robert A.
17th Circuit Court	Boucher, George V.
17th Circuit Court	Cook, George R.
17th Circuit Court	Hoffius, Stuart
17th Circuit Court	Snow, Roman J.
17th Circuit Court	Yared, Woodrow A.
18th Circuit Court	Caprathe, William J.
18th Circuit Court	Penzien, Eugene C.
18th Circuit Court	Theiler, John X.
19th Circuit Court	Batzer, James M.
20th Circuit Court	Bosman, Calvin L.
20th Circuit Court	Townsend, James E.
21st Circuit Court	O'Connell, Paul F.
22nd Circuit Court	Ager, William F., Jr.
22nd Circuit Court	Campbell, Ross W., Jr.

22nd Circuit Court	Conlin, Henry T.
22nd Circuit Court	Conlin, Patrick J.
22nd Circuit Court	Deake, Edward D.
23rd Circuit Court	Ernst, J. Richard
24th Circuit Court	Keyes, Allen E.
25th Circuit Court	Jason, Raymond J.
25th Circuit Court	Quinnell, Edward A.
26th Circuit Court	Ferguson, Robert R.
26th Circuit Court	Swallow, Joseph P.
27th Circuit Court	Thomas, Terrence R.
28th Circuit Court	Peterson, William R.
29th Circuit Court	Green, Timothy M.
29th Circuit Court	Tahvonen, Randy L.
30th Circuit Court	Bell, Robert Holmes
30th Circuit Court	Brown, Thomas Leo
30th Circuit Court	Giddings, James R.
30th Circuit Court	Harrison, Michael G.
30th Circuit Court	Kallman, James T.
30th Circuit Court	Stell, Carolyn
30th Circuit Court	Warren, Jack W.
31st Circuit Court	Corden, James T.
31st Circuit Court	Deegan, Peter E.
31st Circuit Court	Oppliger, Ernest F.
32nd Circuit Court	Cloon, William G., Jr.
33rd Circuit Court	Pajtas, Richard M.
34th Circuit Court	Horn, Carl L.
35th Circuit Court	Lostracco, Gerald D.
36th Circuit Court	Warshawsky, Meyer
37th Circuit Court	Everett, Stanley
37th Circuit Court	Kingsley, James C.
37th Circuit Court	Nicolich, Paul
38th Circuit Court	Kelley, James J., Jr.
38th Circuit Court	Sullivan, Daniel L.
38th Circuit Court	Weipert, William J., Jr.
39th Circuit Court	Glaser, Kenneth B., Jr.
39th Circuit Court	Timms, John C.
40th Circuit Court	Baguley, Norman A.
40th Circuit Court	Clements, Martin E.
41st Circuit Court	Brouillette, Francis D.
41st Circuit Court	Payant, John D.
42nd Circuit Court	Clulo, Paul J.
42nd Circuit Court	Gillespie, Tyrone
43rd Circuit Court	Dodge, Michael E.
44th Circuit Court	Hensick, Bert M.
44th Circuit Court	Latreille, Stanley J.
45th Circuit Court	Noecker, James P.
46th Circuit Court	Davis, Alton T., Jr.
46th Circuit Court	Porter, William A.
47th Circuit Court	Hoehn, Clair J.
47th Circuit Court	Shipman, Dean J.
48th Circuit Court	Corsiglia, George R.
49th Circuit Court	Root, Lawrence C.
50th Circuit Court	Lambros, Nicholas J.
51st Circuit Court	Cooper, Richard I.
52nd Circuit Court	Knoblock, M. Richard
53rd Circuit Court	Livo, Robert C.
54th Circuit Court	Joslyn, Patrick Reed
55th Circuit Court	Hansen, Kurt N.

Recorder's Court	Boyle, Terrance K.
Recorder's Court	Carnovale, Dominick R.
Recorder's Court	Chylinski, James R.
Recorder's Court	Cooper, Evelyn K.
Recorder's Court	Crockett, George W., III
Recorder's Court	Edwards, Prentis
Recorder's Court	Evans, Robert L.
Recorder's Court	Ford, Geraldine Bledsoe
Recorder's Court	Gardner, Samuel C.
Recorder's Court	Gillis, Joseph A.
Recorder's Court	Heading, Henry L.
Recorder's Court	Hobson, Donald Lewis
Recorder's Court	Jackson, Thomas Edward
Recorder's Court	Jasper, Beverley Anne
Recorder's Court	Jobes, Clarice
Recorder's Court	Jones, Vera Massey
Recorder's Court	Kerwin, David P.
Recorder's Court	Moore, Warfield, Jr.
Recorder's Court	O'Brien, John Patrick
Recorder's Court	Ravitz, Justin C.
Recorder's Court	Roberson, Dalton A.
Recorder's Court	Roberts, James E.
Recorder's Court	Sapala, Michael F.
Recorder's Court	Shamo, M. John
Recorder's Court	Silverman, Lawrence D.
Recorder's Court	Strong, Craig S.
Recorder's Court	Talbot, Michael J.
Recorder's Court	Thomas, Edward M.
Recorder's Court	Townsend, Leonard

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Circuit Courts and Recorder's Court

Statewide Summary Of Annual Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The statewide summary of annual circuit court caseload which follows is based on the Circuit Court Caseload Reports submitted to the State Court Administrator on a quarterly basis by circuit court and Recorder's Court officials pursuant to MCR 8.103(4).

All circuit courts submitted reports for the entire calendar year in 1985 for the first time since reporting began.

CIRCUIT COURT CASELOAD REPORT

Statewide Summary

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	APPEALS				DOMESTIC RELATIONS						GENERAL CIVIL	CIVIL DAMAGE SUIT		OTHER CIVIL	CRIMINAL		TOTAL
	Criminal	Civil	Agency	Other	Divorce No Child	Divorce W/Child	Paternity	Initiating URESA	Support	Other		Auto Neg.	Other		Capital	Non-Capital	
BEGINNING PENDING	789	1401	3843	766	14198	29342	8773	805	5836	3569	31177	14828	22817	793	2037	12233	153207
New Cases Filed	675	1076	6382	1980	22446	30351	13136	6288	14398	4155	25106	8756	14055	1187	4306	33874	188171
Re-Opened Cases	21	32	81	17	282	1336	2845	63	168	101	920	303	628	17	432	4468	11714
TOTAL CASELOAD	1485	2509	10306	2763	36926	61029	24754	7156	20402	7825	57203	23887	37500	1997	6775	50575	353092
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:																	
Jury Verdicts	1	0	0	1	0	0	72	0	0	0	213	163	317	2	892	1420	3081
Non-Jury Verdicts	4	2	20	11	484	1161	134	0	2	31	385	29	51	14	642	1631	4601
Guilty Pleas, Defaults, Uncontested, Settled	18	48	696	84	15355	19157	9058	678	3778	817	5655	1350	1587	244	2163	22685	83374
Removal/Transfers	196	120	76	14	19	64	13	267	6	51	2095	1222	2029	24	105	1503	7804
No Progress Dismissals	10	55	296	82	1157	2261	238	75	251	281	3938	1133	1391	135	0	3	11306
Non Service Dismissals	1	3	80	25	542	781	557	38	776	213	614	247	288	31	0	0	4196
Dismissals	239	405	1648	494	2210	4366	2117	338	2150	993	11474	6086	7906	401	601	6035	47463
Other Dispositions	256	527	3929	1221	2048	3501	5722	4945	8087	2016	2179	508	740	343	292	5646	41960
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	725	1160	6745	1932	21815	31291	17911	6341	15050	4402	26553	10738	14309	1194	4695	38924	203785
ENDING PENDING	760	1349	3561	831	15111	29738	6843	815	5352	3423	30650	13149	23191	803	2080	11651	149307
CASES PENDING OVER TWO YEARS	241	375	1012	263	2887	4251	975	32	341	1491	5082	2734	4740	144	18	331	24917

DISTRICT COURT

Public Act No. 236
State of Michigan
Sec. 8101(1)

A district court is established in the state. The district court is a court of record. The state is divided into judicial districts of the district court each of which is an administrative unit subject to the superintending control of the supreme court.

Legend

57 - District Court
(3) - Number District Court Judgeships

SHADED COUNTIES ARE SHOWN IN DETAIL ON REVERSE SIDE.

Number of District Courts	Judgeships	
101	**247**	**December, 1985**

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

Includes Former Judges

1st District Court	Costello, Mary Patricia
1st District Court	LaBeau, Michael W.
1st District Court	Taft, William L.
2-1 District Court	Koselka, Natalia M.
2-1 District Court	Sheridan, James E.
2-2 District Court	Sanderson, Donald L.
3-1 District Court	Coyle, David T.
3-2 District Court	McManus, William L.
4th District Court	Deats, Paul E.
5th District Court	Black, Hugh W.
5th District Court	DeJa, Daniel R.
5th District Court	Fields, John N.
5th District Court	Hammond, John T.
5th District Court	Peterson, David M.
7th District Court	Buhl, William C.
7th District Court	Grier, David C.
8th District Court	Erickson, Karl G.
8th District Court	Long, Kenneth E.
9-1 District Court	Coyle, James P.
9-1 District Court	Davis, Arvin L.
9-1 District Court	Hannon, Ann L.
9-1 District Court	James, Donald E.
9-2 District Court	Fricke, Kenneth A.
10th District Court	Garbrecht, Allen L.
10th District Court	Magnotta, Alfonso A.
10th District Court	Miller, Stephen B.
10th District Court	Penn, Shelton C.
12th District Court	Biewend, Robert E.
12th District Court	Crary, Robert, Jr.
12th District Court	Hall, Lysle G.
12th District Court	Justin, James M.
14A District Court	Bronson, Kenneth
14A District Court	Fink, Karl Voorhies
14A District Court	Fink, Robert V.
14A District Court	Shea, Thomas F.
14B District Court	Collins, John B.
15th District Court	Alexander, George W.
15th District Court	Elden, S. J.
15th District Court	Thomassen, Pieter G. V.
16th District Court	Brzezinski, Robert B.
16th District Court	McCann, James R.
17th District Court	Brang, Robert F.
17th District Court	Dillon, John M.
18th District Court	McKnight, Gail
18th District Court	Smith, Thomas G.
19th District Court	Burtell, Joseph J.
19th District Court	Sobotka, Virginia A.
20th District Court	Dunick Duane
20th District Court	Foran, Leo K.
21st District Court	Hammer, Richard L.
22nd District Court	McCartney, John H.
23rd District Court	Nicita, Anthony
23rd District Court	Sutherland, William J.
24th District Court	DeBiasi, A. R.
24th District Court	Russell, Michael T.
25th District Court	Chapman, William T.

25th District Court	Cicotte, Roy B.
26-1 District Court	Charron, Raymond A.
26-2 District Court	Ciungan, Michael F.
27-1 District Court	Emmert, Lawrence L.
27-2 District Court	Valasco, Glenn C.
28th District Court	Neitzel, Donald C.
29th District Court	Archbold, Carolyn A.
29th District Court	Seiler, John C.
30th District Court	Bayles, Thomas C.
30th District Court	Bledsoe, William F.
30th District Court	Hobson, Donald Lewis
31st District Court	Paruk, Walter Adam
32A District Court	LaRose, Roger J.
33rd District Court	Ferrara, Andrea J.
33rd District Court	McNally, Gerald A.
34th District Court	Stone, James B.
34th District Court	Zaborowski, Henry
35th District Court	Garber, James N.
35th District Court	MacDonald, John E.
36th District Court	Allen, Alex J., Jr.
36th District Court	Baxter, Wendy M.
36th District Court	Blount, Nancy McCaughan
36th District Court	Brock, Gerald
36th District Court	Byrd, Frederick E.
36th District Court	Cooley, Wendy
36th District Court	Cozart, John, Jr.
36th District Court	Curtis, Daphne Means
36th District Court	Donahue, R. Patrick
36th District Court	Doss, Theresa
36th District Court	Edwards, Prentis
36th District Court	Griffin, Rufus, Jr.
36th District Court	Haley, William A., Jr.
36th District Court	Harwood, Pamela R.
36th District Court	Hathaway, William J.
36th District Court	Hood, Denise Page
36th District Court	Jenkins, Leon
36th District Court	Lipscomb, Willie G., Jr.
36th District Court	Lubienski, Ricardo J.
36th District Court	Moore, Marion A.
36th District Court	Murphy, John A.
36th District Court	Nance, Elbert E., Jr.
36th District Court	Perry, John R.
36th District Court	Quinn, Longworth D.
36th District Court	Sattler, Robert J.
36th District Court	Shakoor, Adam A.
36th District Court	Stephens, Cynthia Diane
36th District Court	Stith, Chris E.
36th District Court	Torres, Isidore B.
36th District Court	VanAntwerp, Daniel J.
36th District Court	VanTiem, Thomas A., Sr.
37th District Court	Binkowski, Don
37th District Court	Faunce, Sherman P., III
37th District Court	Kennedy, Thomas Edward
37th District Court	Montgomery, George E.
39th District Court	McDevitt, Mary E.
39th District Court	Ward, William B.
40th District Court	Crouchman, William A.
40th District Court	Oster, Craigen J.

41A District Court	Campbell, Herman C.
41A District Court	Dranchak, Andrew R.
41A District Court	Kosnic, Kenneth J.
41A District Court	McDonell, Thomas W.
41B District Court	Cannon, William H.
41B District Court	Steeh, George C.
42-1 District Court	McLean, Richard D.
42-2 District Court	Cyrul, Richard E.
43rd District Court	Agnello, Joseph S.
43rd District Court	Turner, Robert J.
43rd District Court	Voss, Douglas J. M.
44th District Court	Mann, John R.
44th District Court	Sawicki, Daniel
45A District Court	Norton, John H.
45B District Court	Frankel, Marvin F.
45B District Court	Friedman, Benjamin J.
46th District Court	Cooper, Jessica R.
46th District Court	Feder, Norman W.
46th District Court	Reid, Clarence A., Jr.
47th District Court	Hand, Michael J.
47th District Court	Schaeffer, Margaret G.
48th District Court	Cifelli, Gus
48th District Court	Friedman, Bernard A.
48th District Court	Sosnick, Edward
50th District Court	Brown, Christopher C.
50th District Court	Cunningham, Robert E.
50th District Court	Fairbrother, Louis E.
50th District Court	Stelt, James R.
51st District Court	Carr, Robert W.
51st District Court	Hempstead, Kenneth H.
52-1 District Court	Batchik, Michael
52-1 District Court	Boyle, Martin L.
52-1 District Court	Bulgarelli, Harold M.
52-2 District Court	McNally, Gerald E.
52-3 District Court	Sheehy, James P.
52-3 District Court	Shipper, Robert L.
52-4 District Court	Bolle, William E.
52-4 District Court	Drury, Dennis C.
52-4 District Court	Hunter, Bristol E.
53rd District Court	Gee, David G.
53rd District Court	Merritt, Michael F.
54A District Court	Cherry, Patrick F.
54A District Court	Clem, Terrance A.
54A District Court	Collette, William E.
54A District Court	Davis, John W.
54A District Court	Filice, Charles F.
54A District Court	Thomas, Claude R.
54A District Court	Wood, James J.
54B District Court	Tschirhart, Daniel L.
55th District Court	Brennan, Thomas E., Jr.
55th District Court	Roberts, Thomas R.
56-1 District Court	Holman, Gary R.
56-2 District Court	Berger, Paul F.
56-2 District Court	Hansen, Kenneth A.
57th District Court	Beach, Harry A.
57th District Court	Stewart, Gary A.
58th District Court	Galien, John, Jr.
58th District Court	Kloote, Richard J.

58th District Court	Post, Kenneth D.
59th District Court	Venema, Sherwin J.
60th District Court	Cole, William J.
60th District Court	Farmer, Edward Campbell, Jr.
60th District Court	Grimm, Fredric A., Jr.
60th District Court	Marietti, William C.
60th District Court	Pasarela, Richard J.
61st District Court	Bowler, Patrick C.
61st District Court	Hoekstra, Joel P.
61st District Court	Irons, Carol S.
61st District Court	Johnson, Donald, A., III
61st District Court	Smolenski, Michael Robert
62A District Court	Jelsema, Jack R.
62A District Court	Timmers, Richard H.
62B District Court	Kelly, William G.
63-1 District Court	Servaas, Steven R.
63-2 District Court	White, Joseph B.
64A District Court	Ward, James R.
64B District Court	Mustonen, Arney E.
65-1 District Court	Sheldon, Robert M.
65-2 District Court	Martlew, Jeffrey L.
66th District Court	BeGole, George L.
66th District Court	Fox, Bruce A.
67-1 District Court	Newblatt, Harry P.
67-2 District Court	Mosier, Charles B.
67-2 District Court	Snodgrass, Gerald D.
67-3 District Court	Evans, William R.
67-4 District Court	Black, Ronald W.
67-4 District Court	Caswell, Harland R.
68th District Court	Donnellan, Thomas M.
68th District Court	Horrigan, Albert P.
68th District Court	Kuta, Walter P.
68th District Court	Loyd, Lee Vera
68th District Court	McAra, Michael D.
68th District Court	Shaker, James M.
68th District Court	Siegel, Kenneth M.
70-1 District Court	DeFrancesco, Joseph G.
70-1 District Court	Titus, Harry M.
70-1 District Court	Webber, Daniel R.
70-2 District Court	Bright, Robert E.
70-2 District Court	Scorsone, Bruce J.
70-2 District Court	Tarrant, Kyle Higgs
71A District Court	Connolly, John T.
71A District Court	Dionise, Michael C.
71B District Court	Kern, Richard F.
72nd District Court	Cooley, Richard A., Jr.
72nd District Court	Cummings, John G.
72nd District Court	Kelly, Daniel J.
73-1 District Court	Schubel, John T.
73-2 District Court	Marcus, James A.
74th District Court	Alston, Craig D.
74th District Court	Higgs, Arthur E.
74th District Court	Leaming, John C.
74th District Court	Newcombe, Scott J.
75th District Court	Beale, Thomas A.
75th District Court	Fraser, Robert G.
76th District Court	O'Connell, Peter D.
77th District Court	VanKula, George

78th District Court	Farabaugh, Richard J.
79th District Court	Carney, John R., Jr.
80th District Court	Allen, Gary J.
81st District Court	Hummel, Robert J.
82nd District Court	Mills, Joel I.
83rd District Court	Walsh, Francis L.
84th District Court	Corwin, Charles D.
85th District Court	Danielson, Brent V.
86th District Court	Benedict, Richard L.
86th District Court	McCormick, James R.
87th District Court	Murray, E. Patrick
88th District Court	Johnson, Theodore O.
89th District Court	Johnson, Harold A., Jr.
90th District Court	Varnum, Harvey C.
91st District Court	MacDonald, Michael W.
92nd District Court	Wood, Robert A.
93rd District Court	Stark, Charles H.
94th District Court	DeGrand, Robert J.
94th District Court	Shipman, Dean J.
95A District Court	Barstow, Jeffrey G.
95B District Court	Brouillette, William R.
96th District Court	Collins, James M.
96th District Court	Easton, William S.
97th District Court	Konstenius, William G.
98th District Court	Tingstad, Anders B., Jr.

MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES

East Detroit	Segesta, Benedict
East Detroit	Smith, Martin J.
Grosse Pointe	Kazul, Stan C.
Grosse Pointe Farms	Pytell, Robert
Grosse Pointe Park	Grobbel, Beverly C.
Grosse Pointe Shores	Grobbel, Beverly C.
Grosse Pointe Woods	Schneider, Patricia M.

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan District and Municipal Courts

Statewide Summaries Of Annual Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The statewide summaries of annual district and municipal court caseload which follow are based on caseload reports submitted to the State Court Administrator on a monthly basis by district and municipal court officials pursuant to MCR 8.103(4).

Several courts did not report data for a full calendar year. See the District Court Supplement for a complete description.

Statewide Summary

DISTRICT COURT CASELOAD REPORT

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	CRIMINAL		TRAFFIC	CIVIL			TOTAL	PARKING
	Felony	Misdemeanor	Misdemeanor and Civil	Civil	Small Claims	Summary		
BEGINNING PENDING	24295	89008	810605	67431	20419	8393	1020151	158699
New Cases Filed	54861	191220	508156 1240939	126182	88950	103873	2314181	190435
TOTAL CASELOAD	79156	280228	2559700	193613	109369	112266	3334332	349134
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:								
Guilty Pleas/Admissions of Responsibility	5872	75597	185313	N/A	N/A	N/A	266782	8901
Non-Jury Trials, Hearings Informal Hearings	200	7939	52433	6856	19389	19518	106335	2387
Jury Trials	64	1608	1214	715	N/A	96	3697	0
Preliminary Exams Waived	22045	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22045	N/A
Preliminary Exams Conducted	17034	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17034	N/A
Magistrate Informal Hearings	N/A	N/A	41735	N/A	N/A	N/A	41735	1523
Magistrate Other Dispositions	N/A	38460	242313	N/A	N/A	N/A	280773	8654
Violations Bureau Dispositions	N/A	20250	776030	N/A	N/A	N/A	796280	97065
No Progress Dismissals, Non-Service Dismissals	N/A	N/A	N/A	29121	12148	5434	46703	N/A
All Other Dispositions	9848	43366	375145	93813	53171	77256	652597	41413
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	55061	187220	1674183	130505	84708	102304	2233981	159943
ENDING PENDING	24095	93008	885517	63108	24661	9962	1100351	189191

Statewide Summary

MUNICIPAL COURT CASELOAD REPORT

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	CRIMINAL		TRAFFIC	CIVIL			TOTAL	PARKING
	Felony	Misdemeanor	Misdemeanor and Civil	Civil	Small Claims	Summary		
BEGINNING PENDING	61	372	3286	311	113	20	4163	4969
New Cases Filed	231	2128	8782 14630	729	224	140	26864	9021
TOTAL CASELOAD	292	2500	26698	1040	337	160	31027	13990
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:								
Guilty Pleas/Admissions of Responsibility	66	891	4032	N/A	N/A	N/A	4989	1
Non-Jury Trials, Hearings Informal Hearings	0	389	2207	135	109	71	2911	19
Jury Trials	5	2	8	4	N/A	3	22	0
Preliminary Exams Waived	82	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	82	N/A
Preliminary Exams Conducted	53	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53	N/A
Magistrate Informal Hearings	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Magistrate Other Dispositions	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Violations Bureau Dispositions	N/A	212	15069	N/A	N/A	N/A	15281	5044
No Progress Dismissals, Non-Service Dismissals	N/A	N/A	N/A	96	25	6	127	N/A
All Other Dispositions	15	455	4254	409	157	35	5325	7601
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	221	1949	25570	644	291	115	28790	12665
ENDING PENDING	71	551	1128	396	46	45	2237	1325

PROBATE COURT

The Constitution
State of Michigan
Article VI Sec. 15

"In each county organized for judicial purposes there shall be a probate court. The legislature may create or alter probate court districts of more than one county if approved in each affected county by a majority of the electors voting on the question . . ."

Legend

(3) - Number of Probate Judgeships
O - Probate Court District Number

Number of Probate Courts 83

Judgeships 107

December, 1985

PROBATE COURT JUDGES

Includes Former Judges
*Serve In Probate Court District

Alcona County	Dwyer, Paul T., Jr.	Genesee County	Resteiner, Harold
Alger County	Werner, William A. *	Gladwin County	Strange, Alexander T., II *
Allegan County	Greig, George A.	Gogebic County	Mahoney, Timothy J.
Alpena County	Pugh, Douglas A.	Grand Traverse County	Mackness, Kenneth G.
Antrim County	Unger, John W.	Gratiot County	Harmony, James A.
Arenac County	Bergeron, Ronald M.	Hillsdale County	Neukom, Albert J.
Baraga County	Hood, Garfield W.	Houghton County	Mikkola, John A.
Barry County	Loughrin, Richard N.	Huron County	MacCallum, Neil R.
Bay County	Doner, Paul N.	Ingham County	Drake, Robert L.
Benzie County	Huft, John F.	Ingham County	Economy, Richard George
Berrien County	Dick, Donald J.	Ingham County	Owens, Donald S.
Berrien County	Schillinger, Wilbur	Ionia County	Supina, Gerald J.
Branch County	DeVito, Edward R.	Iosco County	McCready, William H.
Calhoun County	Brundage, John M.	Iron County	Casanova, Oswald G.
Calhoun County	Harter, Phillip E.	Isabella County	Burrows, David E.
Cass County	Phillipson, Herbert E., Jr.	Jackson County	Daly, Kevin J.
Charlevoix County	Murphy, John T. *	Jackson County	Sill, Frederick O.
Cheboygan County	Neale, Joanna	Kalamazoo County	Burge, Donald A.
Chippewa County	Ulrich, Lowell R.	Kalamazoo County	Casey, James S.
Clare County	Strange, Alexander T., II *	Kalamazoo County	Halstead, Donald R.
Clinton County	Robertson, Marvin E.	Kalkaska County	Carlisle, Odell B.
Crawford County	Kraus, Emil L.	Kent County	DeYoung, Donald J.
Delta County	Goebel, Robert E., Jr.	Kent County	Hekman, Randall J.
Dickinson County	Foster, Robert G.	Kent County	Stekette, John P.
Eaton County	Ballard, Robert C.	Kent County	Stoppels, A. Dale
Emmet County	Murphy, John T. *	Keweenaw County	Jaaskelainen, James G.
Genesee County	Gadola, Thomas L.	Lake County	Wickens, Mark S.
Genesee County	Quinn, Luke	Lapeer County	Preisel, Clayton E.

Leelanau County	Weaver, Elizabeth Ann
Lenawee County	Baker, Robert J.
Lenawee County	Kohn, C. Ralph
Livingston County	Rink, Donald E.
Luce County	Ford, Steven E.
Mackinac County	Theut, George J.
Macomb County	Buller, Thomas L.
Macomb County	Nowicki, James F.
Macomb County	Spier, Robert E.
Manistee County	DeVries, John R.
Marquette County	Anderegg, Michael J.
Mason County	Bourisseau, Francis K.
Mecosta County	Hull, LaVail E. *
Menominee County	Rolfs, Craig A.
Midland County	Morris, Donna T.
Missaukee County	Krupp, Frederick S.
Monroe County	Costello, Joseph Anthony, Jr.
Monroe County	Seitz, Harry J.
Monroe County	Seitz, James McCauley
Montcalm County	Vusich, John R.
Montmorency County	Nordstrom, Robert P. M.
Muskegon County	Linck, Tom H.
Muskegon County	Namenye, John J.
Newaygo County	Eggleston, Thomas J.
Oakland County	Barnard, Norman R.
Oakland County	Grant, Barry M.
Oakland County	Moore, Eugene Arthur
Oakland County	O'Brien, John J.
Oceana County	Graham, Gerald T.
Ogemaw County	King, Raymond L.
Ontonagon County	Gotham, Roy D.
Osceola County	Hull, LaVail E. *
Oscoda County	Sperry, Ralph R.
Otsego County	Liedel, Richard J.
Ottawa County	VandeBunte, Jack A.
Presque Isle County	Radzibon, Kenneth A.
Roscommon County	Gaylor, Howard B.
Saginaw County	Harrison, Faye M.
Saginaw County	Troester, Edmund M.
St. Clair County	Barr, R. Gerald
St. Clair County	Spillard, Robert R.
St. Joseph County	Morley, John E.
Sanilac County	Benko, George E.
Schoolcraft County	Werner, William A. *
Shiawassee County	Terbush, Jay M., Jr.
Tuscola County	Kent, W. Wallace, Jr.
Van Buren County	Willis, Frank D.
Washtenaw County	Hutchinson, Rodney E.
Washtenaw County	Wood, Judith J.
Wayne County	Barsamian, Y. Gladys
Wayne County	Gragg, James Robert, Jr.
Wayne County	Lacey, James E.
Wayne County	Maher, Martin T.
Wayne County	Maher, Thomas A.
Wayne County	Pernick, Joseph J.
Wayne County	Szymanski, Anthony J.
Wayne County	Szymanski, Frank S.
Wexford County	Ransom, Walter F.

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Probate Courts

Statewide Summary Of Annual Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The Probate Court Caseload report is now being submitted to the State Court Administrative Office from local courts annually rather than on a semi-annual basis as in previous years. This change in reporting was adopted by the State Court Administrative Office on the recommendation of the Probate Court Forms Committee in an effort to simplify the reporting process and reduce the workload. The year 1985 also marked the increased involvement of the Judicial Data Center in the development of this report. The Judicial Data Center has the capability of compiling data in all twenty-three categories included in the annual report and of returning this information to the local court for their use. All of this data can be generated by the completion of the MCR 5.707 reports.

Filing Fees Collected - State	$ 629,013.53
Inheritance Taxes Collected - State	$55,946,668.34
All Other Fees Collected - State	$ 2,314,855.47
All Other Fees Collected - County	$ 1,86[illegible] 205.68

PROBATE COURT CASELOAD REPORT

Statewide

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

CASE TYPE	Cases Pending at Beginning	Cases Filed	Cases Closed	Cases Pending at End
Decedent Estates - Supervised	34486	14125	12774	35837
Decedent Estates - Independent	9816	6765	7035	9546
Trusts - Inter vivos	45	108	81	72
Trusts - Testamentary	5731	672	671	5732
Guardians - Developmentally Disabled	10918	2227	861	12284
Guardians	36911	10576	5669	41818
Conservators	26254	7220	4109	29365
Adoptions	3786	3901	3704	3983
Escheated Property	905	873	1000	778
TOTALS	128852	46467	35904	139415
Assignments of Property under $5,000	n/a	6726	n/a	n/a
Mentally Ill Petitions	n/a	16690	n/a	n/a
Judicial and Administrative Admissions - DDP	n/a	24	n/a	n/a
Protective Orders	n/a	568	n/a	n/a
Change of Name	n/a	3668	n/a	n/a
Marriage - Secret	n/a	98	n/a	n/a
Marriage - Ceremonies	n/a	525	n/a	n/a
Marriage - 3 Day Waivers	n/a	4152	n/a	n/a
Acknowledgments of Paternity	n/a	16271	n/a	n/a
Safe Deposit Box	n/a	357	n/a	n/a
Trust Registration and Wills for Safekeeping	n/a	32903	n/a	n/a
Appeals to Probate Court	n/a	56	n/a	n/a
Inheritance Tax	n/a	1675	n/a	n/a
Determination of Heirs	n/a	125	n/a	n/a
TOTALS	n/a	83838	n/a	n/a

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Probate Courts - Juvenile Division

Statewide Summary Of Annual Caseload And Activity

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The Monthly Caseload and Activity Report for the Juvenile Division of Michigan Probate Courts provides the basis for compilation of data. This year's annual report marks the first full year the courts have supplied data in this format. Excluded from this year's annual report is information regarding delinquency cases by type of offense and the number of court authorized petitions in delinquency and neglect matters. Because such information has been determined to be of value to particular governmental units, consideration is being given to establishing an appropriate data base.

The data reflected in this report is based on reports submitted by local courts. Several courts did not report data for a full calendar year. See the Probate Court Supplement for a complete description.

Amount Collected For Reimbursement Per MCL 712A.18	$4,571.795.75

PROBATE COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION

Formal Court Services For Delinquency

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Statewide

Number Of Children Under Court Jurisdiction January 1, 1985	Total Number Of Children Accepted For Calendar Year	*Number Of Children Where Court Jurisdiction Ended For Year	**Children Under Court Jurisdiction Supervised By Court	DSS	Number Of Children Under Court Jurisdiction December 31, 1985
9599	12127	10473	8566	1208	10601

Formal Court Services For Neglect/Abuse

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Number Of Children Under Court Jurisdiction January 1, 1985	Total Number Of Children Accepted For Calendar Year	*Number Of Children Where Court Jurisdiction Ended For Year	**Children Under Court Jurisdiction Supervised By Court	DSS	Number Of Children Under Court Jurisdiction December 31, 1985
7709	4616	3984	1852	5882	8117

Informal Court Services For Delinquency

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Number Of Children Under Court Supervision January 1, 1985	Number Of Children Accepted For Informal Court Services During Calendar Year	Number Of Children Under Court Supervision Closed During Calendar Year	Number Of Children Under Court Supervision December 31, 1985
3422	10621	9804	4212

Informal Court Services For Neglect/Abuse

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Number Of Children Under Court Supervision January 1, 1985	Number Of Children Accepted For Informal Court Services During Calendar Year	Number Of Children Under Court Supervision Closed During Calendar Year	Number Of Children Under Court Supervision December 31, 1985
169	647	549	386

Miscellaneous Activities - Delinquency and Neglect/Abuse

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Children Unaccepted For Court Services Delinquency	Children Unaccepted For Court Services Neglect/Abuse	Traffic And Ordinance Hearings For Calendar Year	Waiver Hearings Calendar Year	Number Of Children Served Through Formal Diversion Programs
8050	442	10473	129	12017

Court of Claims

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Court Of Claims

Summary Of Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims, except as otherwise provided by law, extends over claims and demands against the State of any of its departments, commissions, boards, institutions, arms or agencies. Any claimant may bring suit in the Court of Claims provided the claim is in excess of $100.00 except that the State Court Administrative Board is vested with discretionary authority in claims under $1,000.00.

CASES PENDING AT BEGINNING OF YEAR		1,398
Cases Commenced During Year		498
Cases Remanded From Upper Courts		9
Cases Reinstated		9
TOTAL CASES TO BE DISPOSED OF		1,914
Consent Judgment	85	
Dismissed On Stipulation	116	
Dismissed On Motions	147	
Voluntary Dismissal	9	
Dismissed By Court	14	
Judgment For Plaintiff	29	
Judgment For Defendant	23	
Default Judgment For Plaintiff	2	
Settled	4	
Discontinued By Stipulation	23	
Dismissed For Lack Of Progress	65	
Dismissed For Lack Of Service	12	
Remanded - Removed	3	
TOTAL CASES DISPOSED OF DURING YEAR		532
TOTAL CASES PENDING AT END OF YEAR		1,382
Cases Pending Two Years Or Longer	660	
Cases Appealed To Court Of Appeals During Year	79	
Cases Reassigned	41	
Cases Joined With Pending Circuit Court Actions In Other Circuit Courts	135	

State Court
Administrative Office

Committees

ADOPTION COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The Adoption Court Forms Committee is responsible for the revision of all probate court adoption forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and statutes. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Richard N. Loughrin, Chair
Judge
Barry County Probate Court

John Atkins
Director
Allegan County Juvenile Court

Eleanor Austin
Director
Wayne County Juvenile Court

Hon. James S. Casey
Judge
Kalamazoo County Probate Court

Phyllis Cornell
Assistant Executive Director
Child and Family Services of Michigan

John Davis
Systems Services Manager
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Gloria Fenske
Register
Midland County Probate Court

Mary Kaye
Office Manager
Genesee County Juvenile Court

Hon. Donna T. Morris
Judge
Midland County Probate Court

Norman Nigro
Attorney
Southfield

Jill Olson
Officer
Calhoun County Juvenile Court

Eugene Thompson
Chief and Referee
Oakland County Probate Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

DATA AND INFORMATION SHARING TASK FORCE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES - JUDICIARY LIAISON COMMITTEE

The Task Force, established jointly by Dr. Agnes Mansour of the Michigan Department of Social Services and Chief Justice G. Mennen Williams, is one of the four task forces to collaboratively review and recommend remedies for selected major concerns facing both branches of government. The purpose of the Committee was to make recommendations on how to improve the collection of uniform data and information sharing within and between the Michigan Department of Social Services and the juvenile courts. Specific attention was focused on juvenile court proceedings and the corresponding transactions within the Michigan Department of Social Services. The final report was completed in August, 1985. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Marilyn K. Hall, Chair
Executive Assistant
Office of the Chief Justice

Hon. Y. Gladys Barsamian
Judge
Wayne County Probate Court

Robert Bee
Director
Bureau of Regulatory Service
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Hon. Faye M. Harrison
Judge
Saginaw County Probate Court

John W. Vis
Director
Kent County Juvenile Court

STAFF

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE SUB-COMMITTEE

The Child Support Guideline Committee is a sub-committee of the Friend of the Court Advisory Committee appointed to assist the Friend of the Court Bureau in the development of child support guidelines. In January, 1985 the Child Support Guideline Committee issued a first draft of the Proposed Child Support Guidelines. Seven public information forums were held during March, sixteen presentations were made before interested groups, and public and professional comments were received until mid-year. In August, 1985 the Child Support Guideline Committee issued a second draft of the Proposed Child Support Guidelines and accepted public and professional comments for sixty days. Two public forums were held and twenty-one presentations were made before interested groups. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Katherine L. Barnhart
Women's Lawyers Association

Hon. Marianne O. Battani
Judge
3rd Circuit Court

Ulysses Beasley
Fathers for Equal Rights

Izetta F. Bright
Attorney at Law

Charles A. Burkholder
Director
Kent County Family Service

Leslie Campbell
Help Every Abduction Return Today

Hon. Michael H. Cherry
Judge
15th Circuit Court

Pat Cleary
Investigator - Friend of the Court
Wayne County

Pat Cronin
Referee - Friend of the Court
Oakland County

Evelyn Green
Friend of the Court
Gratiot County

Patti Holden-Myatt
Michigan Women's Commission

Max D. McCollough
Attorney
Family Law Council of the Michigan Bar Association

James A. Pocock
Friend of the Court
Gratiot County

Rev. Steve Sower
Fathers Who Care

Pat Turner
Kids in Need Deserve Equal Rights

Kent Weichman
Referee - Friend of the Court
Washtenaw County

Kent Wilcox
Fathers for Equal Rights

STAFF

Ulysses Hammond
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Rebecca Kiwala
Staff
State Court Administrative Office

Sue Rummel
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

CIRCUIT COURT SYSTEM USER PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Circuit Court System User Planning Committee was established to advise the Judicial Data Center in the development of an automated on-line record keeping and case processing system to meet the needs of Michigan circuit courts. The system will be pilot tested in 1986. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee during 1985 include:

Barbara Albertson
County Clerk
Bay County

Ruth Ann Brown
Administrator
23rd Circuit Court

Tim Class
Deputy County Clerk
St. Clair County

Patricia Corrion
Court Clerk
Bay County

Roma Jo Dijak
County Clerk
Arenac County

Nora Fair
Deputy County Clerk
Branch County

Ardis Heacock
County Clerk
Otsego County

Joanne Jones
Chief Deputy County Clerk
Allegan County

Joyce McLain
Administrator
26th Circuit Court

Lois Oppertshauser
County Clerk Staff
St. Clair County

Billie Pollack
Assignment Clerk
15th Circuit Court

Patricia Rodgers
County Clerk
Kalkaska County

Donna Sawicki
Deputy County Clerk
Otsego County

Russell Sill
County Clerk
Allegan County

JoAnn T. Swartz
Administrator
34th Circuit Court

Linda Twitchell
County Clerk
Eaton County

Willie Baase
Deputy County Clerk
Roscommon County

David Cable
Administrator
10th Circuit Court

Faye C. Claus
County Clerk
Presque Isle County

Nancy Cunningham
Deputy County Clerk
Alpena County

Judy Elliott
County Clerk
Branch County

Kathleen Frost
Administrator
18th Circuit Court

Sondra Houlton
County Clerk
Oscoda County

Philip B. Larson
Administrator
31st Circuit Court

Alta Miller
County Clerk Staff
St. Clair County

Deborah Parks
Assignment Clerk
46th Circuit Court

Judy Prokup
Deputy County Clerk
Kalkaska County

William Rutledge
Data Processing Manager
48th Circuit Court

Sharon Schultz
Administrative Assistant
18th Circuit Court

Gail Simmons
Bookkeeper
26th Circuit Court

David Teggerdine
Deputy County Clerk
Livingston County

Elizabeth H. Wieland
County Clerk
Crawford County

Vicki Bourdage
Assignment Clerk
26th Circuit Court

Hon. Michael H. Cherry
Judge
15th Circuit Court

M. Jeanne Clement
County Clerk
Montmorency County

Jean DeWalt
Deputy County Clerk
Eaton County

Therese Ellison
Administrator
5th Circuit Court

Carol Guy
Chief Deputy County Clerk
Kalkaska County

C. Duke Hynek
Administrator
9th Circuit Court

Beverly Lowrie
Deputy County Clerk
Crawford County

Anne C. Moore
County Clerk
Alcona County

Edward Perrin
Data Processing Director
44th Circuit Court

Phyllis Pyke
Administrator
46th Circuit Court

Marion Sargeant
County Clerk
St. Clair County

Bob Seelinger
Data Processing Manager
46th Circuit Court

Blondie Smolinski
Deputy County Clerk
Alpena County

Linda Tober
Deputy County Clerk
Bay County

Annabelle Wilder
County Clerk
Alpena County

STAFF

Berniece Blackmer
Field Services Supervisor
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Douglas Carrell
Systems Program Manager, CSES
State Court Administrative Office

Mark Dobek
Senior Programmer Analyst
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Jacque Ward
Center Services Administrator
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Richard Wilhelm
Executive Director
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

CIRCUIT COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The Circuit Court Forms Committee in collaboration with the District Court Forms Committee is responsible for the development and revision of Michigan Court forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and statutes and to promote uniform practices and procedures throughout the Michigan court system. In addition, the Committee developed several forms specific to use in the circuit courts. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Robert C. Anderson, Co-Chair
Judge
6th Circuit Court

Joan Young, Co-Chair
Administrator
6th Circuit Court

Jeffrey Albaugh
Administrator
37th Circuit Court

Daniel Bambery
Attorney
Legal Aid of Central Michigan

K. Kent Batty
Administrator
3rd Circuit Court

Berniece Blackmer
Field Services Supervisor
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Salvatore Crimando
Administrator
16th Circuit Court

Hon. S. J. Elden
Judge
15th District Court

Hon. Sharon Tevis Finch
Judge
3rd Circuit Court

George Hathaway
Attorney
Plain English Committee

C. Duke Hynek
Administrator
9th Circuit Court

Joe Kimble
Liaison
Plain English Committee

Christina Kuzara
Liaison
Plain English Committee

Philip Larson
Administrator
31st Circuit Court

Joyce D. McLain
Administrator
26th Circuit Court

Virginia Noell
Assignment Clerk
48th Circuit Court

Nancy O'Shea
Paralegal
Foster, Swift, Collins & Coey

Robert L. Pangle
Chief Assistant
Kalamazoo County Prosecutor

Hon. Eugene Penzien
Judge
18th Circuit Court

Betty Prout
County Clerk
Isabella County

Phyllis Pyke
Administrator
46th Circuit Court

Robert W. Smith
County Clerk
Roscommon County

JoAnn T. Swartz
Administrator
34th Circuit Court

Al Thomas
Assistant
Wayne County Friend of the Court

Daniel Voss
Chief Deputy Clerk
30th Circuit Court

Elda Wells
County Clerk
Mecosta County

Ann Wing
Attorney
Plain English Committee

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

Greg Ulrich
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office, Region I

CIRCUIT COURT STATISTICS STEERING COMMITTEE

The Circuit Court Statistics Steering Committee assisted in the design and implementation of a project initiated by Judge Daniel F. Walsh to explore means for providing judges with current case inventory information. The project pilot tested a batch reporting system in two circuit courts. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Jeffrey Albaugh
Administrator
37th Circuit Court

K. Kent Batty
Administrator
3rd Circuit Court

Hon. Michael Harrison
Judge
30th Circuit Court

Jeffrey Porter
County Clerk
Midland County

Joan Young
Administrator
6th Circuit Court

Lynn D. Allen
County Clerk
Oakland County

David Cable
Administrator
10th Circuit Court

C. Duke Hynek
Administrator
9th Circuit Court

Betty Prout
County Clerk
Isabella County

Ivan Anthony
County Clerk
Mason County

Hon. Michael H. Cherry
Judge
15th Circuit Court

Philip Larson
Administrator
31st Circuit Court

David Young
Administrator
30th Circuit Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Hon. Daniel F. Walsh
State Court Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Stephen D. Conley
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Bruce D. White
Chief Deputy Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Saundra Smith
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Richard Wilhelm
Executive Director
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

FEDERAL AND STATE TAX OFFSET TASK FORCE

A Task Force to assist in the development of a policy and procedure for federal and state tax offsets was appointed during 1985. The purpose of the Task Force was to discuss the federal and state legislation implications on the Friend of the Court Office, Office of Child Support, and Michigan Department of Treasury. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Jerry Brockmyre
Director, Office of Child Support
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Robert Coulon
Friend of the Court
Macomb County

Marc Rogers
Office of Child Support

Hon. Paul Clulo
Judge
42nd Circuit Court

Martha Griffiths
Lieutenant Governor

Ann Wieber
Office of Child Support

Jim Cotton
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Russell Prins
Attorney General's Office

Phillip Wippel
Michigan Department of Treasury

STAFF

Ulysses Hammond
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

DISTRICT COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The District Court Forms Committee in collaboration with the Circuit Court Forms Committee is responsible for the development and revision of Michigan Court forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and statutes and to promote uniform practices and procedures throughout the Michigan court system. In addition, the Committee developed and revised several forms specific to use in the district courts. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. S. J. Elden, Chair
Judge
15th District Court

Berniece Blackmer
Field Services Supervisor
Michigan Judicial Data Center

Carol Conklin
Clerk/Administrator
53rd District Court

Robert L. Cooper
Assistant
Washtenaw County
Prosecutor's Office

Hon. Theresa Doss
Judge
36th District Court

Thomas A. Fasse
Supervisor of Traffic
61st District Court

Jan Hammerlind
Clerk/Administrator
61st District Court

George Hathaway
Attorney
Plain English Committee

Paul Kanan
Manager, Traffic and Ordinance
36th District Court

Hon. William G. Kelly
Judge
62B District Court

Nancy Moylan
Clerk/Administrator
54B District Court

Tom Poole
Deputy Administrator
36th District Court

Bob Randolph
Clerk/Administrator
15th District Court

Dave Recher
Clerk/Administrator
3-2 District Court

Ed Rinn
Clerk/Administrator
75th District Court

Don Sherburne
Clerk/Administrator
8th District Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

Greg Ulrich
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office, Region I

DISTRICT COURT SYSTEMS USER COMMITTEE

The District Court Systems User Committee provides direction for changes and modifications to the district court system and development of new services. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Frank Blomgren
Supervisor, Court Liaison and Special Services Division
Michigan Department of State

Shirley Chaffee
Clerk/Administrator
51st District Court

Lawrence Chastang
Clerk/Administrator
22nd District Court

Arthur Chettle
Clerk/Administrator
68th District Court

Carol Conklin
Clerk/Administrator
53rd District Court

Ruth Cook
Clerk/Administrator
24th District Court

James Covault
Clerk/Administrator
2-2 District Court

Sandra Crowley
Clerk/Administrator
12th District Court

Judith DeKeyser
Clerk/Administrator
32A District Court

Ronald Downing
Clerk/Administrator
76th District Court

Dona Gillson
Clerk/Administrator
64B District Court

Kirby Goodwin
Clerk/Administrator
57th District Court

Doris Hanulcik
Clerk/Administrator
64A District Court

Anthony Hufnagel
Clerk/Administrator
65-2 District Court

LaVonne Johnson
Clerk/Administrator
62A District Court

A. L. Kirschenbauer
Clerk/Administrator
54A District Court

Dorothy Kraus
Clerk/Administrator
33rd District Court

Irene Krueger
Clerk/Administrator
28th District Court

Gary Lough
Magistrate
77th District Court

Joseph Mysliwiec
Clerk/Administrator
16th District Court

Cheryl Narregan
Clerk/Administrator
10th District Court

Ed Nykiel
Clerk/Administrator
33rd District Court

Ramona Plummer
Clerk/Administrator
2-1 District Court

Michael Ramsey
54A District Court

Bob Randolph
Clerk/Administrator
15th District Court

David Recher
Clerk/Administrator
3rd District Court

Edward Rinn
Clerk/Administrator
75th District Court

Norman Rushing
Clerk/Administrator
25th District Court

Don Sherburne
Clerk/Administrator
8th District Court

Kevin Sutherland
Clerk/Administrator
44th District Court

John VanSlambrouck
Clerk/Administrator
1st District Court

Mary Ann Watts
Clerk/Administrator
52-4 District Court

George Wiland
Clerk/Administrator
35th District Court

STAFF

Berniece Blackmer
Field Services Supervisor
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Kevin J. Bowling
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Julie Bucciarelli
Field Services Representative
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Stephen D. Conley
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Jack C. Crandall
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Robert Ferguson
Field Services Representative
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Ulysses Hammond
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Barbara Harbin
Field Services Representative
State Court Administrative Office

Mary Leger
Senior Programmer Analyst
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Linda Lenahan
Field Services Representative
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Herbert Levitt
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Hon. V. Robert Payant
State Court Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Richard Schneider
Systems Supervisor
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Bruce White
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Richard Wilhelm
Executive Director
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Advisory Committee was appointed by the State Court Administrator to consult with program staff regarding policies and procedures affecting the Foster Care Review Board Program. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Arnie Boezaart, Chair
Program Manager
Muskegon County
Department of Social Services

Eleanor Austin, Vice Chair
Director
Wayne County Juvenile Court

Carol Barbier
Wayne County Board Chair
Detroit

Lillian Bernstien
Wayne County Board Chair
Detroit

Randy Besbris-Levin
Program Coordinator
Children's Aid Society

Sue Blandford
Kent County Board Chair
Grand Rapids

Patrick Buckley
Kalamazoo County Board Chair
Portage

Samuel Chambers, Jr.
Deputy Director
Wayne County
Department of Social Services

John Cole
Program Manager
Kent County
Department of Social Services

James Dykstra
Foster Care Supervisor
Kalamazoo County
Department of Social Services

Jane Garcia
Detroit

Hon. Robert Geake
State Senator
Northville

Hon. David Hollister
State Representative
Lansing

Hon. Teola Hunter
State Representative
Detroit

Lisa Kaichen
Director
Children's Charter of the
Courts of Michigan

Frank Marella
Director
Macomb County Juvenile Court

Barbara McLean
Director
Lutheran Social Services of Michigan

Sharon Miller
Wayne County Board Chair
Detroit

John Peck
Capitol Area Foster Parents
Association

Hon. Lana Pollack
State Senator
Ann Arbor

Hon. Gary Randall
State Representative
Elwell

Mark Robinson
Program Manager
Boysville of Michigan

Charles Rubel
Director
Family and Child Services

Linda Coleman Shirkey
Bureau Director
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Hon. Alma Stallworth
State Representative
Detroit

David Stanifer
Director
Lenawee County Juvenile Court

Wilma Tays
Program Specialist
Kalamazoo County Juvenile Court

Addie Williams
Children's Services Advocate
Wayne County
Department of Social Services

Hon. Judith J. Wood
Judge
Washtenaw County Probate Court

Hon. Joseph Young, Jr.
State Representative
Detroit

STAFF

Thomas Kissling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Dinah Payne
Staff
State Court Administrative Office

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARDS

The Foster Care Review Board Program was established by 1980 PA 376 as a pilot project administered by the State Court Administrative Office. This program creates citizen review boards to review individual neglect and abuse cases within the foster care system to assist the court in ensuring prompt and permanent child placement. The program was continued and expanded by 1984 PA 422. Currently, seven review boards exist in Wayne County and a single review board exists in each of the following counties: Kalamazoo, Kent, Lenawee, Muskegon, and Washtenaw. Local citizens representative of their community who served on the various review boards in 1985 include:

Kalamazoo County

Patrick Buckley, Chair
Portage, Michigan

Diane Schrock
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Janet Dancer
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Joe Todd
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Mary Morris
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Kent County

Sue Blandford, Chair
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Debra Gaffney
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Carol Bennett
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Daniel L. Groce
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Marie Boersma
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Richard T. Tormala
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Lenawee County

Gratia K. Koch, Chair
Manitou Beach, Michigan

Terry L. Long
Tecumseh, Michigan

Fred Eaton
Adrian, Michigan

Charles Ojeda
Adrian, Michigan

Frances A. Gorny
Adrian, Michigan

Muskegon County

Billy R. Scott, Chair
Muskegon, Michigan

Marilyn J. Ross
Muskegon, Michigan

Ardyce V. England
Muskegon, Michigan

Francis D. Scott
Muskegon, Michigan

Raymond D. Leonard
Twin Lake, Michigan

Washtenaw County

George E. Foltz, Chair
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Karen S. Gordon
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John Rodney Alton
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Janie M. Jones
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Karna Doyle
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Maxine Boord Virtue
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Wayne County

Carol Barbier, Chair
Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan

Sharon Miller, Chair
Detroit, Michigan

Andrew Robinson, Sr., Chair
Detroit, Michigan

Clara Anderson
Detroit, Michigan

Georgia Brown
Detroit, Michigan

Loretta Curtis
Detroit, Michigan

Lillian Bernstein, Chair
Detroit, Michigan

Carol Quarterman, Chair
Detroit, Michigan

June Adkins
Detroit, Michigan

Lucile C. Arrellano Gajec
Detroit, Michigan

Cornelia Carson
Detroit, Michigan

Isaac H. Dansby
Detroit, Michigan

Sister Mary Brigid Clingman, Chair
Detroit, Michigan

Emma Robertson, Chair
Detroit, Michigan

Charleana N. H. Allen
Detroit, Michigan

Marlene J. Beasley
Detroit, Michigan

Ollie Carter
Detroit, Michigan

Dorothy J. Davis
Detroit, Michigan

Lisa Denton
Detroit, Michigan

Wilma Howell
Detroit, Michigan

Verna J. McIntosh
Detroit, Michigan

Deborah Patterson
Detroit, Michigan

Cynthia Stevens
Grosse Pointe Farms, Michigan

Willa M. Tye
Detroit, Michigan

Mildred White
Detroit, Michigan

Beverly Flewellen
Detroit, Michigan

Alice L. James
Detroit, Michigan

Mary Moffett
Detroit, Michigan

Serena L. Peaks
Detroit, Michigan

Elizabeth M. Stucki
Detroit, Michigan

Christopher J. Wathen
Detroit, Michigan

Linda Williams
Detroit, Michigan

Vincent Givhan
Detroit, Michigan

Donald C. Johnson
Detroit, Michigan

Beatrice Paige
Detroit, Michigan

May Polk
Detroit, Michigan

Albert Thomas
Detroit, Michigan

Donna Welborn
Detroit, Michigan

Lawrence A. Zybura
Detroit, Michigan

FRIEND OF THE COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The State Court Administrative Office established a nine-person advisory committee to advise the Friend of the Court Bureau in the performance of its duties as established by the Friend of the Court Act (MCL 552.501 et seq.). Likewise, this Committee serves as the State's Child Support Commission which is to examine, investigate, and study the State's child support system. The Advisory Committee is composed of three professional members, three attorney members, three public members, and two non-voting Friend of the Court members. In 1985 the Committee supervised the progress of the Child Support Guidelines Committee, recommended a policy and procedure for income tax interception, developed a Friend of the Court Bureau Survey, assisted in the development of a training program for Friend of the Court clerical personnel, assisted the Bureau in examining and approving a private mediator training program, and established operating by-laws. Local court personnel and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Charles Burkholder, Chair
Professional Member
Kent County Family Service

Hon. Paul J. Clulo
Judge, Attorney Member
42nd Circuit Court

Gerhard Ritsema
Friend of the Court Member
Wayne County

Patricia R. Turner
Public Member
Kids in Need Deserve Equal Rights

Izetta F. Bright
Attorney Member
Private Practice Attorney
(appointed in June, 1985)

Edward D. Gold
Attorney Member
Private Practice Attorney

Hon. Gene Schnelz
Judge, Attorney Member
6th Circuit Court
(resigned in June, 1985)

Joan Walker
Professional Member
Federation of Private Child and Family Agencies

Leslie Campbell
Public Member
Help Every Abduction Return Today

Ronald E. Machnik
Friend of the Court Member
Jackson County

Rev. Steve Sower
Public Member
Fathers Who Care

Phyllis Waltz
Professional Member
Private Counselor

STAFF

Judy Bartell
Staff
State Court Administrative Office

Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Pamela Creighton
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Ulysses Hammond
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

FRIEND OF THE COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The Friend of the Court Forms Committee is responsible for the development and revision of Friend of the Court forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and new federal and state legislation. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Brian Walsworth, Chair
Friend of the Court
Missaukee/Wexford Counties

Jeffrey Albaugh
Friend of the Court
Calhoun County

Dace Bremanis
Referee/Attorney
Calhoun County

Eileen Derragon
Assistant Friend of the Court
Ingham County

Jon Ferrier
Referee/Attorney
Kent County

Evelyn Green
Friend of the Court
Gratiot County

Patricia Harper
Friend of the Court
Ottawa County

Richard C. Higgs
Friend of the Court
Allegan County

Joel Hott
Liaison
Office of Child Support
Michigan Department of Social Services

James Pocock
Friend of the Court
Ingham County

Wanda R. Raich
Friend of the Court
Midland County

Colleen Steinman
Friend of the Court
Clinton County

Joan Young
Administrator
6th Circuit Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Pamela J. Creighton
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

Sue Rummel
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

FRIEND OF THE COURT TRAINING SUB-COMMITTEE

The Training Committee is a sub-committee of the Friend of the Court Advisory Committee which was established to assist the Friend of the Court Bureau in assessing training needs and developing training programs. During 1985 Committee members assisted in the development of the Friend of the Court Receptionist Training and reviewed and recommended changes in the Private Domestic Relations Mediation Training program which was submitted to the Bureau for certification. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Joan Walker, Chair
Federation of Private Child and Family Agencies

Tom Harmon
Friend of the Court
Branch County

Sharon Tillman
Mediator - Friend of the Court
Isabella County

Phyllis Waltz
Private Counselor

STAFF

Judy Bartell
Staff
State Court Administrative Office

Pamela Creighton
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

JUVENILE COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The Juvenile Court Forms Committee is responsible for the development and revision of Juvenile Court forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and statutes. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Roger Likkel, Chair
Director
Calhoun County Juvenile Court

John Davis
Systems Services Manager
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Mary Gohl
Office Supervisor II
Oakland County Juvenile Court

Hon. Richard N. Loughrin
Judge
Barry County Probate Court

Hon. Clayton Preisel
Judge
Lapeer County Probate Court

David Stanifer
Director
Lenawee County Juvenile Court

Eleanor Austin
Director
Wayne County Juvenile Court

Penny Fleishmann
Juvenile Register
Midland County Juvenile Court

Mary Kaye
Officer Manager
Genesee County Juvenile Court

Norman Nigro
Attorney
Southfield

Hon. Marvin E. Robertson
Judge
Clinton County Probate Court

Hon. Edmund M. Troester
Judge
Saginaw County Probate Court

Nancy L. Clark
Director
Leelanau County Juvenile Court

Bill Fox
Director, Adoption Subsidy Program
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Hon. Raymond L. King
Judge
Ogemaw County Probate Court

Hon. H. E. Phillipson, Jr.
Judge
Cass County Probate Court

Gary Secor
Director
Ionia County Juvenile Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

MAGISTRATE MANUAL REVISION COMMITTEE

A complete revision of the 1979 Manual for District Court Magistrates was completed in 1985. The manual represents the work of the Magistrates Manual Revision Committee which worked over one year on this project. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Darlene Bates
Magistrate
85th District Court

Deborah Plog
Education Program Administrator
Michigan Judicial Institute

Joyce Bucher
Magistrate
5th District Court

Angelina Straight
Magistrate
65-1 District Court

Vincent Lauria
Magistrate
61st District Court

John F. VanSlambrouck
Magistrate
1st District Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Stephen D. Conley
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Saundra Smith
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

MICHIGAN ADULT PROTECTIVE TASK FORCE OF THE STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE AND THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Chief Justice G. Mennen Williams and Dr. Agnes Mansour, Director of the Michigan Department of Social Services, appointed a Task Force to study and recommend solutions to problems relating to recruitment, training, retention, supervision, and funding of qualified persons to serve as guardians for Michigan citizens requiring support. Local court personnel and other professionals who served on the Task Force in 1985 include:

Hon. Daniel Walsh, Chair
State Court Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Hon. V. Robert Payant, Chair*
State Court Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Mary Lou Blanchard
Director, Adult Community Services Division
Michigan Department of Social Services

Hon. Raymond L. King
Judge
Ogemaw County Probate Court

Hon. Joseph J. Pernick
Judge
Wayne County Probate Court

Douglas Slade
Register
Ingham County Probate Court

Robert Worgul
Staff, Adult Community Services Division
Michigan Department of Social Services

STAFF

Jack C. Crandall
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

*Replaced Judge Walsh as Chair in June, 1985.

MICHIGAN COURT REPORTING AND RECORDING BOARD OF REVIEW

The Michigan Court Reporting and Recording Board of Review, as prescribed by Michigan Court Rule, is composed of one Court of Appeals judge, one trial judge, one court reporter, one court recorder, and one attorney and a Board secretary assigned from the staff of the State Court Administrative Office. The Board administers certification examinations for court reporters and recorders semi-annually. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Myron H. Wahls, Chair
Judge
Court of Appeals

Janell I. Bates
Certified Shorthand Recorder
Spaniolo & Lundquist

Hon. Calvin L. Bosman
Judge
20th Circuit Court

William Booth
Attorney
Detroit

Nancy Gass
Certified Electronic Reporter
Jackson

STAFF

Stephen D. Conley,
Executive Secretary
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Jeannene Hinds
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

PROBATE COURT FORMS COMMITTEE

The Probate Court Forms Committee is responsible for the development and revision of Probate Court forms to comply with the Michigan Court Rules and statutes. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Richard N. Loughrin, Chair
Judge
Barry County Probate Court

Loren W. Campbell
Retired Judge
Ann Arbor

Pat Clarke
Administrator, Policy and Records
Michigan Department of Mental Health

J. Robert Cooper
Register
Washtenaw County Probate Court

John Davis
Systems Services Manager
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Janet Deering
Register
Ogemaw County Probate Court

Leonard Edelman
Attorney
Farmington Hills

Hon. Rodney E. Hutchinson
Judge
Washtenaw County Probate Court

Mary Kaye
Office Manager
Genesee County Juvenile Court

Hon. Raymond L. King
Judge
Ogemaw County Probate Court

Norman Nigro
Attorney
Southfield

Hon. H. E. Phillipson, Jr.
Judge
Cass County Probate Court

Wendell Schoder
Attorney
Battle Creek

Douglas Slade
Register
Ingham County Probate Court

Hon. Gerald J. Supina
Judge
Ionia County Probate Court

Hon. Anthony J. Szymanski
Judge
Wayne County Probate Court

William M. Travis
Attorney
Ortonville

Betty VanAlstine
Register
Mecosta County Probate Court

Eleanore Walentowicz
Register
Macomb County Probate Court

STAFF

Kevin J. Bowling
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Bill Frysinger
Forms Consultant
Frysinger Business Forms

Amy L. Nelson
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

PROBATE COURT ON-LINE SYSTEM USER COMMITTEE

The Probate Court On-Line System User Committee advises the Judicial Data Center regarding the development of specifications for the probate court on-line system and modifications to the system. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

John Atkins
Director
Allegan County Juvenile Court

John Dowsett
Director
Oakland County Juvenile Court

Alice Hein
Administrative Assistant
Oakland County Probate Court

Roger Likkel
Director
Calhoun County Juvenile Court

Chris Pretzer
Computer Supervisor
Macomb County Probate Court

Sharon Teasley
Court Executive
Wayne County Probate Court

Doris Barnes
Register
Sanilac County Probate Court

Melvyn Foster
Systems Analyst
Wayne County Probate Court

Mary Alice Irish
Register
Lapeer County Probate Court

Mary Nicholson
Systems Analyst
Wayne County Juvenile Court

Curt St. John
Administrative Assistant
Genesee County Probate Court

Eleanore Walentowicz
Register
Macomb County Probate Court

J. Robert Cooper
Register
Washtenaw County Probate Court

Linda Hays
Register
Allegan County Probate Court

John Kinkema
Register
Bay County Probate Court

Margaret Pleasant
Register
Genesee County Probate Court

Janet Schmidt
Deputy Register
Washtenaw County Probate Court

Lorraine Weber
Administrator
Wayne County Probate Court

STAFF

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

John Davis
Systems Services Manager
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Charles Taylor
Systems Supervisor
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

PROBATE DOCKET CASE TRACKING COMMITTEE

The Probate Docket Case Tracking Committee was established by Supreme Court Administrative Order. The Committee is responsible for the development of a case tracking system for each functional division or unit within the Probate Court (Juvenile, Mental, and Estates). In early 1986 the Committee recommended development of a statewide computer system to implement the case tracking system. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Y. Gladys Barsamian, Chair
Judge
Wayne County Probate Court

Hon. Michael J. Anderegg
Judge
Marquette County Probate Court

Hon. James S. Casey
Judge
Kalamazoo County Probate Court

Barbara Consilio
Director
Oakland County Juvenile Court

Harold Dyer
Director
Kalamazoo County Juvenile Court

Lisa Kaichen
Director
Children's Charter of the Courts of Michigan

Roger Likkel
Director
Calhoun County Juvenile Court

Hon. Tom H. Linck
Judge
Muskegon County Probate Court

Hon. Richard N. Loughrin
Judge
Barry County Probate Court

Margaret Pleasant
Register
Genesee County Probate Court

Hon. Elizabeth Ann Weaver
Judge
Leelanau County Probate Court

STAFF

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

John Davis
Systems Services Manager
Judicial Data Center
State Court Administrative Office

Ulysses Hammond
Associate Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

SENTENCING GUIDELINES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Sentencing Guidelines Advisory Committee was appointed by the Michigan Supreme Court to oversee the development, testing, and revision of sentencing guidelines. In 1985 the Committee began preparing comprehensive revisions to the guidelines which will be submitted to the Supreme Court for approval in 1986. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Committee in 1985 include:

Hon. Michael F. Cavanagh,
Supervising Justice
Associate Justice
Supreme Court

Hon. Robert A. Benson
Judge
17th Circuit Court

Hon. Robert L. Evans
Judge
Recorder's Court

Hon. Hilda R. Gage
Judge
6th Circuit Court

Hon. Michael G. Harrison
Judge
30th Circuit Court

Hon. William A. Porter
Judge
46th Circuit Court

STAFF

Margaret A. Bossenbery
Program Assistant
State Court Administrative Office

Kevin J. Bowling
Regional Administrator
State Court Administrative Office

Michael Murray
Commissioner
Supreme Court

Charles W. Ostrom, Jr.
Professor/Research
Political Science Department
Michigan State University

Garret E. Peaslee
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

TASK FORCE ON PROBATE COURT CERTIFICATION OF FOSTER HOMES AND MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES OF JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITIES

The Task Force was established by Chief Justice G. Mennen Williams and Dr. Agnes Mansour, Director of the Michigan Department of Social Services, to consider two issues and to develop recommendations which would ameliorate current problems attendant to these issues. The issues considered were: 1) the certification of probate court (juvenile division) foster homes to the Michigan Department of Social Services for licensure in view of the 1982 state appellate court decision determining probate courts not to be child care organizations as defined by 1973 PA 116; and 2) the inspection criteria used by the Michigan Department of Social Services to evaluate juvenile detention facilities and the current administrative rules to reflect the variety of child care residential facilities which are presently operated by probate courts. Local court representatives and other professionals who served on the Task Force in 1985 include:

Harold S. Gazan, Chair
Director, Special Services
Administration
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Robert Bee
Director, Child Welfare
Licensing
Michigan Department of
Social Services

John Dowsett
Director
Oakland County Juvenile Court

Cynthia Harrison
Director, Bureau of Regulatory
Services
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Larry Meisner
Director, Institutional
Services Division
Michigan Department of
Social Services

Hon. Donald Owens
Judge
Ingham County Probate Court

STAFF

J. Otis Davis
Court Analyst
State Court Administrative Office

Assignment of Judges

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Assignment Of Judges

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The Michigan Constitution, 1963, Art. VI, Sec. 23 and MCL 600.225, 600.226, 600,306, 600.825, 600.829, and 600.8212, as amended, authorize assignment of judges from one court to another either by direct order of the Supreme Court or through the State Court Administrator.

Judicial vacancies occur during the year due to retirement, death, or serious illness which require an assignment to provide temporary assistance to a court which is experiencing a sudden increase in trial work or a series of lengthy trials. Assignments are also made when a court is behind in its work or when a case requires disqualification of a particular judge or an entire bench.

In most instances, assignments to the Court of Appeals or the Circuit, District, or Probate Courts are made without regard to whether the assigned judge regularly sits on that court. For example, it is not unusual for a Probate Judge to be assigned to a Circuit Court, District to Circuit, Circuit to Court of Appeals, etc. This flexibility provides most efficient use of judicial resources.

ASSIGNMENTS - RETIRED OR FORMER JUDGES

	Court of Appeals	Circuit Court	Recorder's Court	District Court	Probate Court	Municipal Court	Court of Claims	Marriages	Total
Region 1	0	5[illegible]	1	134	116	20	0	50	371
Region 2	8	44	0	44	30	0	3	22	151
Region 3	0	20	0	5	2	0	0	9	36
Region 4	0	13	0	4	1	0	0	7	25
Total	8	127	1	187	149	20	3	88	583

ASSIGNMENTS - ACTIVE JUDGES

	Court of Appeals	Circuit Court	Recorder's Court	District Court	Probate Court	Municipal Court	Court of Claims	Marriages	Total
Region 1	25	209	4	235	58	27	0	367	925
Region 2	40	231	0	286	220	0	93	69	939
Region 3	0	249	0	163	333	0	0	30	775
Region 4	2	248	0	212	366	0	0	17	845
Total	67	937	4	896	977	27	93	483	3,484

Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System

May 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

AGENCY PURPOSE

The Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System (MAACS) was created by the Appellate Defender Commission to fulfill the Commission's mandate to develop a statewide indigent appellate defense system which includes the services of both the State Appellate Defender Office and private assigned counsel pursuant to MCLA 780.712; MSA 28.1114(102). Although 75% of all indigent felony appeals are handled by private assigned counsel, until the advent of MAACS, no uniform statewide method of qualifying and selecting those attorneys existed. The statute requires the Commission to compile and keep current a statewide roster of attorneys eligible for and willing to accept appointment as criminal appellate defense counsel and to provide continuing legal education for those attorneys. MAACS is the administrative office which actually screens the qualifications of attorneys seeking to join the statewide roster, compiles local lists of roster attorneys willing to accept appointments in each circuit and the Detroit Recorder's Court, provides training programs and resource materials to roster attorneys, and monitors compliance with the Minimum Standards for Indigent Criminal Appellate Defense Services approved by the Supreme Court.

The agency's goals are to ensure that only qualified attorneys receive appellate appointments, that appointments are fairly distributed pursuant to objective criteria, and to enhance the ability of private counsel to provide competent appellate representation through the provision of training and supportive services. The agency also maintains files on all cases assigned to private counsel, which permit the collection of data regarding caseloads, fees, and the substantive work performed. MAACS also collects the briefs filed by roster attorneys for placement in a centralized brief bank maintained by the Legal Resources Project of the State Appellate Defender Office.

AGENCY PROCEDURE

Attorneys wishing to serve as appellate assigned counsel must submit an application to MAACS. Each attorney is classified as either Level I or Level II based on the attorney's experience, with only Level II attorneys being eligible to handle the more serious offenses. Level I attorneys are required to complete a basic orientation program before receiving any appointments. Attorneys indicate on their applications the jurisdictions from which they wish to receive appointments. MAACS compiles a local list for each circuit and the Recorder's Court of roster attorneys willing and eligible to receive appointments from that jurisdiction.

Each local list of attorneys is rotated by non-judicial personnel pursuant to regulations issued by the Appellate Defender Commission. Copies of all orders of appointment are forwarded to MAACS, which monitors the rotation of local lists.

MAACS also monitors the allocation of appointments between roster attorneys and the State Appellate Defender Office which, under the regulations, is to receive a percentage of the appointments in each jurisdiction. In addition, MAACS responds to inquiries from defendants, courts, and other interested parties concerning the conduct of indigent appeals. Should it appear that a roster attorney is failing to provide adequate representation as defined by the Minimum Standards for Indigent Criminal Appellate Defense Services, the attorney's name may be removed from the statewide roster, subject to appeal to the Appellate Defender Commission.

ACTIVITY

The Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System opened its doors on May 1, 1985. The staff consists of an administrator, an administrative assistant, and a secretary. The first several months of operation were devoted to consulting with trial judges and court administrators around the State regarding the implementation of the new appointment system. A notice appeared in the September issue of the Michigan Bar Journal soliciting attorney participation in the statewide roster. The two-day orientation program was held in the fall at several locations around the State for attorneys wishing to qualify to receive appellate appointments. The training program was videotaped for future showings to new applicants. Every attorney joining the roster is provided free of charge with a copy of a two-volume appellate practice and procedure manual prepared by the State Appellate Defender Office under a grant from the Michigan Justice Training Commission.

The new appellate assignment system officially became effective on December 2, 1985, at which time there were 274 attorneys on the statewide roster. It is anticipated that roster membership will level off at about 375 attorneys. It is also anticipated that MAACS will be responsible for monitoring approximately 2,400 indigent appeals annually, not including those assigned to the State Appellate Defender Office.

Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission

MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION MEMBERS

Professor Lawrence A. Dubin, Attorney
of Detroit
Chairman
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires September 30, 1986

Angus G. Goetz, Jr., Attorney
of Birmingham
Vice Chairman
Appointed by the State Bar
Term Expires September 30, 1987

Kermit G. Bailer, Attorney
of Dearborn
Secretary
Appointed by the State Bar
Term Expires September 30, 1987

George J. Bedrosian, Attorney
of Detroit
Member
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires September 30, 1988

Dr. Stuart M. Bundy
of Dearborn
Member
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires September 30, 1988

Dennis C. Kolenda, Attorney
of Grand Rapids
Member
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires September 30, 1988

Sally A. Wright
of Troy
Member
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires September 30, 1986

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission

October 1, 1984 - September 30, 1985

COMMISSION PURPOSE

The Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission was created by the Supreme Court, effective October 1, 1978. Along with the simultaneously created Attorney Discipline Board, the Commission succeeded the State Bar Grievance Board, which thereby expired. Pursuant to MCR 9.108(A), the Commission is the prosecution arm of the Supreme Court for the discharge of its constitutional responsibility to supervise and discipline Michigan attorneys. The Commission, which has statewide jurisdiction, has its offices in Detroit.

The Attorney Grievance Commission is comprised of seven persons who served without compensation and are appointed as follows:

Three lawyers appointed by the Supreme Court; two public members appointed by the Supreme Court; and two lawyers appointed by the Board of Commissioners of the State Bar of Michigan.

COMMISSION PROCEDURE

Subchapter 9.100 of the Michigan Court Rules governs the conduct of attorney disciplinary proceedings.

Grievances filed against attorneys are denominated "requests for investigation." Any person may file a request for investigation with the Grievance Administrator and the Grievance Administrator may file his own request for investigation where necessary. The filing of a request for investigation initiates the grievance process.

Following the filing of a request for investigation, the Grievance Administrator must determine whether there exists a prima facie allegation of professional misconduct, i.e. a violation of Michigan Court Rule 9.104. The Grievance Administrator may reject the request for investigation on its face or after a preliminary investigation or he may conduct a full investigation. If the Grievance Administrator does not reject the request for investigation, he will, upon conclusion of the investigation, recommend to the Commission that (1) the matter should be closed as there is not provable evidence of professional misconduct sufficient to sustain the burden of proof at a disciplinary proceeding, or (2) authorization should be granted for the issuance of a formal complaint.

In the reported fiscal year, October 1, 1984 to September 30, 1985, 2,875 requests for investigation were filed, as opposed to 2,808 for the previous year. This modest increase of 2.4% contrasts with a 13% decline in the preceding year. However, this

marks the second straight year since 1978-1979 in which the number of requests for investigation filed failed to exceed 3,000.

Of the 2,875 grievances received, 1,567 were rejected by the Grievance Administrator pursuant to MCR 9.112(C)(1)(a); there were 783 closed by the Commission pursuant to MCR 9.114(A)(2); 69 were closed administratively; 117 resulted in confidential admonishments; and 166 were authorized by the Commission for formal proceedings. The pending investigative caseload saw a 66% increase, from 325 at the beginning of the period to 538 as of September 30, 1984. Representing 18.7% of the total annual intake, the pending investigative caseload is at its highest level in the last 5 years, but is still favorable in comparison with those of other jurisdictions. The average pending investigative caseload per staff attorney stands at 90 cases per attorney which is beginning to approach the limits of manageableness.

Assisting the full-time professional staff are some 200 special investigators. These investigators are members of the State Bar of Michigan who perform pro bono publico on behalf of the Commission and who are reimbursed only for actual out-of-pocket expenses. Their function is to provide on-site investigation in the field to develop an investigation which commenced at staff level and to report back to staff counsel who will then assess the matter and submit a recommendation to the Grievance Administrator. Approximately 10% of the formal investigations are referred to special investigators.

In prosecuting formal complaints before Hearing Panels of the Attorney Discipline Board (the Supreme Court's adjudicative agency for attorney discipline) the Grievance Administrator and his professional staff are assisted by some 200 special counsel, who, like the special investigators, are members of the State Bar of Michigan who donate their services to the Commission. In the 1978-1979 fiscal year approximately half of all prosecutions were performed by special counsel. However, as a result of a program which commenced in the 1979-1980 fiscal year, the role of special counsel has diminished greatly to the point where only 1% of prosecutions were performed by special counsel in fiscal year 1983-1984, with the full-time professional staff being responsible for the rest. It is anticipated that the use of special counsel will be phased out completely.

LITIGATION

Upon authorization by the members of the Commission, the Grievance Administrator causes a complaint to be prepared and filed with the Attorney Discipline Board. The only exception to this is in the case of criminal convictions, where an order to show cause is issued by the Board commanding the respondent to show cause why discipline should not be imposed. This procedure for criminal convictions, and a companion provision for the automatic interim suspension for felony convictions, has been in effect since February 1, 1983 as a result of the Supreme Court's adoption of a proposal by the Attorney Grievance Commission. The Grievance Administrator is the party-petitioner to every formal charge of misconduct, whether by formal complaint or order to show cause.

Hearings on charges of misconduct are held before three-lawyer hearing panels of the

Attorney Discipline Board. The hearings are open to the public. In the case of a formal complaint, the Grievance Administrator is required to prove his case by a preponderance of the evidence. The respondent may retain counsel, cross-examine witnesses proffered by the Grievance Administrator and present evidence in his own behalf, both in defense and in mitigation. In hearings on an order to show cause, the respondent has the initial burden of going forward and may present evidence in mitigation. However, he is precluded from attempting to attack collaterally the criminal conviction which is the foundation of the order to show cause. The practice and procedure employed in non-jury civil cases are applicable to disciplinary proceedings as are the Michigan Rules of Evidence.

Upon conclusion of the hearings, if the panel finds that the Administrator has failed to prove misconduct by a preponderance of the evidence, the case against the respondent must be dismissed. If the panel concludes that professional misconduct has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, the panel must enter an order of discipline which may consist of a reprimand, probation, suspension or disbarment. A suspension or disbarment disqualifies the respondent from the practice of law, whereas a reprimand is in the nature of a public censure. Probation is in the nature of a supervised reprimand and is available only under limited circumstances. All discipline in Michigan is a matter of public record. (The admonishment issued by the Commission is confidential and is an administrative warning not constituting discipline.)

Any party, including the complainant who filed the request for investigation, may appeal any order of a hearing panel as of right to the Attorney Discipline Board and may seek leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from an order of the Attorney Discipline Board.

FUNDING

The expenses of the Attorney Grievance Commission for the fiscal year October 1, 1984 - September 30, 1985, as reported by the State Bar, were $797,882.20. Pursuant to Michigan Court Rule 9.105, the entire expenses of the Commission were paid by the State Bar of Michigan. No public tax dollars were employed in the funding of the Commission's operations.

A copy of the full annual report is available from the State of Michigan, Attorney Grievance Commission, Suite 256, Marquette Building, 243 West Congress Street, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission

Activity Report

October 1, 1984 - September 30, 1985

I. Investigations:

A. Files Pending At Beginning of Period		325
B. New Files Opened	2,875	
C. Files Reopened	40	
D. Rejected Pursuant to MCR 9.112(C)	1,567	
E. Closed Pursuant to MCR 9.114(A)(2)	783	
F. Closed Administratively	69	
G. Closed with Admonishment	117	
H. Authorized for Formal Complaint	166	
I. Total Files Disposed of During Period	2,702	
J. Investigative Files at End of Period		538

II. Litigation:

Final Dispositions During Period:

1. Disbarred	9	
2. Suspended 3 Years or More	5	
3. Suspended More Than 119 Days But Less Than 3 Years	17	
4. Suspended Less Than 120 Days	10	
5. Total Suspended		32
6. Inactive Status	3	
7. Probation	2	
8. Reprimand	25	
9. Total Final Disciplines	71	

Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission

MICHIGAN JUDICIAL TENURE COMMISSION MEMBERS

Hon. Thomas J. Foley, Judge
of 3rd Circuit Court, Detroit
Chairman
Elected by the State Bar
Term Expires December 31, 1988

Marjorie Peebles-Meyers, M.D.
of Detroit
Secretary
Gubernatorial Appointee
Term Expires December 31, 1987

Hon. Hilda R. Gage, Judge
of 6th Circuit Court, Pontiac
Member
Elected by the Circuit Court Judges
Term Expires December 31, 1988

Rabbi Irwin Groner
of Southfield
Member
Gubernatorial Appointee
Term Expires December 31, 1986

Hon. James R. McCann, Judge
of 16th District Court, Livonia
Member
Elected by the District Court Judges
Term Expires Decmeber 31, 1986

John S. Abbott, Esq., Dean
of Detroit College of Law
Vice Chairman
Elected by the State Bar
Term Expires December 31, 1986

Leo A. Farhat, Esq., Attorney
of Lansing
Member
Elected by the State Bar
Term Expires December 31, 1987

Hon. Barry M. Grant, Judge
of Oakland County Probate Court, Pontiac
Member
Elected by the Probate Court Judges
Term Expires December 31, 1987

Hon. Harold Hood, Judge
of Court of Appeals, Detroit
Member
Elected by the Appellate Court Judges
Term Expires December 31, 1988

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission

July 1, 1984 - December 31, 1985

INTRODUCTION

This is a summary of the sixteenth Annual Report of the Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission covering activities from July 1, 1984 through December 31, 1985. Following the review of activities over this eighteen month period, the format of these reports reverts to a calendar year basis.

The past reporting period has also seen a marked continuation of increased investigative and formal activity. This continued upward trend further justifies the need for an agency dedicated to the betterment of the judiciary. This report manifests a continuing effort to foster a greater awareness among the public, bench, and bar of the Commission's service to the State of Michigan.

BACKGROUND

Michigan created its Judicial Tenure Commission when voters passed an amendment to Article VI, Section 30 of the Michigan Constitution in August, 1968. The enabling court rule is now codified in MCR 2.900. The Judicial Tenure Commission serves to promote the integrity of the judicial process and preserve public confidence in the courts. It strives to hold judges accountable for their misconduct without jeopardizing or compromising the essential independence of the judiciary. The basis for Commission action is a violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct or Rules of Professional Responsibility. The Code is published with the Michigan Court Rules. A copy may be obtained from the Commission upon request.

COMMISSION AUTHORITY

The Commission has the authority to review written grievances which allege judicial misconduct or disability and, after a preliminary investigation of the facts and circumstances, to determine whether a formal complaint should be filed against a judge. After a public hearing, before itself or an appointed Master, the Commission may recommend to the Supreme Court, where appropriate, that a judge be either censured, suspended with or without salary, retired, or removed from office. The types of state judges under the Commission's authority are Justices of the Supreme Court and judges of the Court of Appeals, circuit court, Recorder's Court, probate court, district court, municipal court. In addition, magistrates and referees are subject to the Commission's authority.

COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

The Commission is comprised of nine members serving staggered terms of three

years. Two lay members are appointed by the Governor and neither of these appointees may be a judge nor an attorney. Three members are elected at large by the State Bar, one of whom is a judge and two who are attorneys. Four members are elected by judges of the courts in which they serve, the Court of Appeals, circuit courts, probate courts, and courts of limited jurisdiction each being represented.

TYPE OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

Judicial misconduct is conduct in violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct or Canons of Professional Responsibility which may include, but is not limited to, the following:

(a) Conviction of a felony;
(b) Persistent failure to perform judicial duties;
(c) Habitual intemperance (i.e., appearing in court under the influence of alcohol);
(d) Conduct clearly prejudicial to the administration of justice;
(e) Persistent incompetence or neglect in the performance of judicial duties.

Additionally, a judge is removable from office for physical or mental disability which prevents the performance of his or her judicial duties for a substantial period of time.

FILING A GRIEVANCE

Anyone may file a grievance with the Commission. The grievance must be in writing with grievant's signature notarized. It should state facts about the conduct or disability believed to be the cause for complaint.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF GRIEVANCES

The Constitution and Court Rules safeguard the confidentiality of all grievances and their investigation except as to the parties involved.

Prior to the filing of a formal complaint, neither Commissioner nor staff member may disclose the existence or contents of an investigation. An exception may occur when, in the public interest, the Commission may issue a public statement confirming a pending investigation or a completed investigation resulting in insufficient evidence for filing a complaint.

After a formal complaint is filed, it is a matter of public record and all subsequent proceedings are conducted in open public hearings.

COMMISSION ACTION ON A GRIEVANCE

The Commission must determine initially whether a grievance appears to be valid and well-founded and alleges facts indicating misconduct or disability. This is accomplished through preliminary inquiry by the staff. Many grievances are dismissed at this stage as without sufficient merit.

If the grievance proves to have substance, the judge under investigation receives notice of the allegations and is given a reasonable opportunity to respond. Thereafter, the Commission must consider the judge's reply and determine whether or not to bring formal charges by the filing of a formal complaint.

The Commission may dismiss a grievance of a relatively minor nature and privately caution a judge with respect to his conduct, or, under appropriate circumstances, enter a recommendation of private censure with the Supreme Court. An order of private censure must be kept secret and confidential.

If, as a result of a formal hearing, misconduct is established, the Commission must render its own decision regarding the case and recommend suitable discipline to the Supreme Court. Upon a review of the entire record, the Court may accept, reject, or modify the recommendation of the Commission.

SUMMARY OF GRIEVANCES CONSIDERED

The information contained in this report covers the period from July 1, 1984 to December 31, 1985 and has been broken down to reflect the separate reporting periods of July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985 and July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985.

Since its inception in 1968, the Commission has opened 3,481 files concerning grievances against judicial officers. 330 grievances were received during the period from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985 and 346 grievances reached final disposition resulting in a period-end caseload of 93 pending grievances. 173 grievances were received during the period from July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985 and 175 grievances reached final disposition resulting in a period-end caseload of 89 pending grievances.

The Commission received 503 requests for investigation during the reporting period. A total of 631 grievance forms were mailed to aggrieved parties in response to written or telephone inquiries. Twelve advisory opinions were issued to judges or judicial candidates. Additionally, many other general questions regarding the judiciary and the discipline process were answered.

CONCLUSION

Michigan's judicial watchdog agency continues its attempt to preserve the honesty and integrity of the judges of this State. As indispensable ingredients of its success, the Commission must rely on the dedication of the bench and bar to the highest moral and ethical standards, as well as the confidence of the public in the fairness of its work. By means of its vigilance, the Commission serves to repair and reinforce the fabric of justice which holds our society together.

A copy of the full annual report is available from the State of Michigan, Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission, 910 Lafayette Building, 144 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission

Summary of Grievances Considered

July 1, 1984 - December 31, 1985

GRIEVANCE SOURCES	July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985	July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985
LITIGANTS	244	129
NONLITIGATING CITIZENS	38	9
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS	18	16
PUBLIC OFFICIALS	8	2
JUDGES	2	0
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE REFERRALS	0	1
ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION REFERRALS	17	15
BAR GROUPS	2	1
COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION	1	0
TOTALS	330	173

SUBJECT MATTER OF GRIEVANCES	July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985	July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985
COURT ROOM DEMEANOR	40	26
INTEMPERANCE	3	7
CONFLICT OF INTEREST	8	4
POLITICAL ACTIVITY	4	0
PREJUDICE OR PARTIALITY	169	84
CRIMINAL CONVICTION OR ACTIVITY	14	7
FAILURE TO PERFORM, INCOMPETENCE OR NEGLECT	16	12
REVIEW OF LEGAL RULING	16	7
REVIEW OF MERITS	54	11
PERSONAL MISCONDUCT	4	2
PROCEDURAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITY	11	0
ATTORNEY MISCONDUCT	6	5
PHYSICAL OR MENTAL DISABILITY	0	10
MISCELLANEOUS	1	0
TOTALS	346	175

DISPOSITIONAL BREAKDOWN	July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985	July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985
CAUSE FOR APPEAL	71	46
WITHOUT MERIT	235	103
LACK OF JURISDICTION	9	1
JUDGE CORRECTED PROBLEM	1	0
ADMONITION TO JUDGE	8	12
COMMISSION RECOMMENDED SANCTION TO SUPREME COURT	5	8
OTHER	17	4
TOTALS	346*	175**

*Of this total number, 281 grievances were dismissed without investigation
**Of this total number, 140 grievances were dismissed without investigation

CATEGORY OF JUDGE COMPLAINED AGAINST	July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985	July 1, 1985 to December 31, 1985
SUPREME COURT JUSTICES	3	0
COURT OF APPEALS	2	0
CIRCUIT	131	65
RECORDER'S COURT	29	13
PROBATE	55	20
DISTRICT	121	66
MUNICIPAL	1	1
MAGISTRATE	1	1
REFEREE	1	1
FEDERAL JUDGE	2	0
RETIRED JUDGE	6	6
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE	3	1
ATTORNEY	2	1
TOTALS	357*	175

*The total figure reflects the fact that several grievances concerned more than one judge

State Appellate Defender

STATE APPELLATE DEFENDER OFFICE COMMISSION MEMBERS

William R. Walsh, Jr., Attorney
of Port Huron
Chairman
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires May 24, 1987

John E. S. Scott, Attorney
of Detroit
Secretary
Appointed by the State Bar
Term Expires May 24, 1987

Ronald L. Dzierbicki, Chief Clerk
of Court of Appeals, Lansing
Member
Appointed by the Court of Appeals
Term Expires May 24, 1986

John C. Emery, Jr., Attorney
of Grosse Pointe
Member
Appointed by the State Bar
Term Expires May 24, 1987

Beatrice P. Millender, Law Student
of Detroit
Member
Appointed by the Governor
Term Expires May 24, 1988

Hon. Richard E. Robinson, Retired Judge
of Northport
Member
Appointed by the Circuit Judges Association
Term Expires May 24, 1989

Hon. Vesta Svenson, Magistrate
of 36th District Court, Detroit
Member
Appointed by the Supreme Court
Term Expires May 24, 1987

ANNUAL REPORT

State Appellate Defender Office

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

HISTORY

The State Appellate Defender Office was established in 1970 pursuant to Michigan Supreme Court Administrative Order 1970-1. Its purpose was to provide competent, quality legal representation of indigent criminal defendants in post-conviction matters. The Office currently operates pursuant to 1978 PA 620 (MCL 780.711 et seq.), which superceded Administrative Order 1970-1. The State Appellate Defender Office continues to be governed by the seven-member State Appellate Defender Commission which also oversees the private component of the Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System (MAACS).

Defender James R. Neuhard continues to head all operations of the State Appellate Defender Office, the public defender component of the State's assigned counsel system. In early 1985, after the Legislature appropriated adequate funds to run the private roster component of the appellate assigned counsel system, the Commission hired Barbara R. Levine to administer the assignment of all appellate counsel. The commission adopted regulations for operation of the system, and full operation began on December 2, 1985. The mixed (public defender/private roster) representation scheme contemplated in 1978 PA 620 and Michigan Supreme Court Administrative Order 1981-7 is on the way to becoming a reality.

Under the Commission's regulatory scheme, the State Appellate Defender appears on the local list of the assigned counsel roster in every third, fourth or fifth slot, depending on the ratio of attorneys to the number of criminal felony appeals taken in the jurisdiction. Thus, the State Appellate Defender Office may receive anywhere from one-third to one-fifth of the appellate assignments from a given jurisdiction, but no less than 25% of the State's total number of indigent felony appeals. The private roster attorneys handle the remaining 75% of indigent criminal appeals.

Over the last eight years, the State Appellate Defender Office has accepted an average of 700 cases a year, and based on MAACS figures expects to continue to receive a similar number of assignments over the next few years. At the end of 1985, the State Appellate Defender Office had received appointments from all but fourteen of Michigan's counties: Keweenaw, Ontonagon, Leelanau, Antrim, Grand Traverse, Alcona, Ogemaw, Clare, Montcalm, Sanilac, Lapeer, Kent, Livingston, and Hillsdale.

STAFF

During 1985 fourteen staff attorneys, two research attorneys, the Defender, Chief Deputy Defender, Legal Resources Project Director, and Training Coordinator were housed in the Detroit office. Four staff attorneys and the Deputy Defender were housed in the Lansing office. These attorneys and administrators were

supported by ten legal secretaries, an investigator and paralegal assistant, eight administrative assistants, two and one-half clerks, and one receptionist. Special assistant defenders, part-time law students, and post-graduate legal research assistants were employed as funds were available.

As has happened since 1980, paralegal and criminal justice students from Michigan State University, Mercy College, Henry Ford College, and other schools have been used to provide paralegal-type assistance to the staff. These students work for credit toward degrees.

As in previous years, the State Appellate Defender Office designated one of its staff attorneys to teach the Criminal Appellate Practice Course at the University of Michigan Law School. Each semester approximately twelve to fourteen course students provide research assistance on twelve to fourteen real cases assigned to that teaching attorney in return for credits and the unique learning experience the course offers.

With the assistance of research attorneys and researchers, the attorneys in the State Appellate Defender Office's specialized unit, designed to handle appeals requiring expeditious action and to handle a high volume of cases by screening and batch processing simple or similar cases, was able to process twice as many post-conviction matters as its regular attorney and one to two research assistants processed 187 cases in 1985. They obtained some form of relief in over 47% of those cases.

CASE ACTIVITY

The Defender Office is appointed to cases by the Michigan Supreme Court, the Michigan Court of Appeals, the Michigan circuit courts, and the Recorder's Court for the City of Detroit to represent indigent criminal defendants on felony appeals and a variety of other post-conviction proceedings.

A State Appellate Defender attorney's work consists of reviewing transcripts and lower court records, interviewing clients, investigating, researching issues, filing all necessary pleadings, and conducting hearings and oral arguments at all levels of the Michigan and Federal judiciaries. Attorneys make regular client visits and lower court appearances in virtually all areas of this state. They appear before the Michigan Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, and, in selected cases, before Michigan's federal district courts, the Federal Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court.

During 1985 the Office's eighteen staff attorneys and two deputies handled a mixture of 509 cases, and the Special Unit attorneys took 187 permanent assignments and handled 17 cases that were eventually assigned to others. Attorneys received a total of 696 new cases. Fifty-two of those appeals were special assignments (these range from United States Supreme Court briefs to responses to prosecutor appeals), 376 were pleas, and 268 were trials.

Between January 1, 1985 and December 31, 1985 the Office received 728 new assignments. At the close of the year it had 1,021 open-active cases, had closed 763

cases, and processed a total of 1,784 cases. The adoption of the new guilty plea rule by the Michigan Supreme Court, requiring that most plea-based post-conviction matters originate in the trial court, and various Court of Appeals holdings, requiring that issues relating to sentencing originate there as well, have caused a substantial increase in attorney travel time. Statistics depicting 1985 case activity follow this narrative.

COLLATERAL SERVICES AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

In addition to the above described direct client services, the Office was involved in several collateral areas and special projects. The Legal Resources Project, in its eighth year, responded to more than 3,800 requests for assistance, provided more than 50,000 pages of materials, and reached more than one thousand subscribers through the Criminal Defense Newsletter, in addition to providing support for the legal staff through advice and opinion summaries.

With the aid of a grant from the Michigan Justice Training Commission, the Project's director produced the 700-plus page Defender Trial Book and the State Appellate Defender Office's training director produced the 1,200-plus page, two volume, second edition of the Michigan Criminal Appeals manual.

Michigan Justice Training funds obtained by the State Appellate Defender Office and the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan enabled those two organizations to continue to conduct general training programs for attorneys representing indigent criminal defendants and provided specific training in criminal appellate practice and procedure for some 300 private assigned appellate defense counsel in conjunction with the Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel Office.

State Appellate Defender Office attorneys played a major role in all these training programs. In addition, the State Appellate Defender Office's Special Unit's manager authored the comprehensive booklet, Felony Sentencing In Michigan and the "Sentencing Benchguide" section of the Michigan Judicial Institute's Trial Court Bench Guides (MJI, 1986).

Through the commendable efforts of its Special Projects Coordinator and the hard work of many others, the State Appellate Defender Office has completed the automation of its word and data processing systems. Barrister, the computer company from which the Office purchased its equipment and a leading provider of computer equipment and services for major law firms throughout the country, was so impressed by the Office's creative and proficient use of its equipment it contracted with the Office to have its Special Projects Coordinator prepare a user's guide for law firms and made the Office a beta cite for its data management system.

Finally, office attorneys appeared and testified at legislative hearings on matters relating to criminal justice and worked with legislators and legislative committees on criminal law and procedure and corrections matters. Office attorneys also served on many boards, commissions, committees, and task forces working on criminal justice programs, some of these at the national level. The Defender, himself, is the president-elect of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

ANNUAL REPORT

State Appellate Defender Office

Activity Report

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Total New Assignments	728
Carryover Of Open Cases	293
Total Cases Closed	763
Total Cases Processed	1,784

LAST ACTION ON OPEN CASES

I. TRIAL COURT

Cases Assigned To SADO, No Claim Filed - Transcript Not Received	88
Cases Assigned To SADO, No Claim Filed - Transcript Received	72
Motion New Trial/Withdraw Plea	12
Motion Bond/Credit/Other	10
Motion Resentence	9
SADO Brief/Prosecutor Brief Filed	3
Motion/Request Substitution Of Counsel - Conflict Case	3
No Action Calendar Year	2
Remanded, Hearing/Decision Pending	1
Orals Held On Probate Court Appeal To Circuit Court	1
TOTAL	201

II. COURT OF APPEALS

Claim Filed - Transcript Received	203
SADO And Prosecutor Briefs Filed	115
Oral Argument Had	107
SADO Brief Filed	65
Claim Filed - No Transcript	61
Motion Remand Pending/Granted	24
Motion Resentencing/Peremptory Reversal/Other	13
Motion Bond	8
Supplemental Brief	7
SADO/Prosecutor Motion Rehearing	7
Motion/Stipulation Dismiss Pending	7
Motion In Trial Court - Court Of Appeals Action Pending	5
Motion Guidance	4
Application Leave/Delayed Appeal	4
Held In Abeyance	2
Request Substitution Of Counsel - Conflict Case	1
No Action Calendar Year	1
TOTAL	634

III. SUPREME COURT

Application For Leave To Appeal With Brief	114
Application For Leave To Appeal - Held In Abeyance	23
Leave Granted, Brief Filed	9
Motion Rehearing	8
Motion Dismiss	4
Cases Assigned To SADO - Transcript Received	3
Leave Granted - Oral Argument Had	3
Prosecutor Application Leave	3
Motion Bond	2
Leave Granted	2
TOTAL	171

IV. UNITED STATES COURTS - DISTRICT/APPEALS/SUPREME

Petition Writ Of Habeas Corpus	4
Motion Dismiss	4
SADO/Prosecutor Briefs	3
Oral Argument Had	4
TOTAL	15

ACTIVITY ON CLOSED CASES

I. TRIAL COURT

Dismissed By Motion/Stipulation	34
Substitute Counsel Appointed/Retained	21
Reversed Plea/Sentence/Conviction	8
Motion New Trial Granted/Denied	6
Motion Vacate Plea/Sentence/Conviction Denied	3
Other Disposition	3
TOTAL	92

II. COURT OF APPEALS

Regular Disposition	250
Appeal Dismissed By Stipulation/Motion	129
Consolidated With Other SADO Case	5
Appeal Dismissed - Client Died	1
Application Leave/Delayed Appeal Denied	2
TOTAL	387

III. SUPREME COURT

Leave Denied - SADO	235
Reversed And Remanded	18
Leave Denied - Prosecutor	10
Affirmed	9
Leave Granted - SADO (New Case Started)	5
Appeal Dismissed By Motion/Stipulation	2
Other	2
TOTAL	281

IV. UNITED STATES COURTS - DISTRICT/APPEALS/SUPREME

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari Denied	1
Dismissed Court Motion	2
TOTAL	3

FILINGS BY STATE APPELLATE DEFENDER OFFICE

Trial Court	250
Court Of Appeals	1,662
Supreme Court	306
United States Courts	43
TOTAL	2,261

1985 ASSIGNMENTS

Pleas	408
Trials	301
Specials	19
TOTAL	728

DISPOSITIONS OF ALL CLOSED CASES SINCE 1970 FORMATION

I. TRIAL COURT

Assigned In Error, Improper Assignment, Etc.	36
Assigned To Advise Client Only	1
Withdrew As Counsel	38
Client Retained Own Counsel	18
Client Missing, No Possible Action	2
Case/Appeal Dismissed	72
Appeal Withdrawn	32
Client Released on Habeas Corpus	1
SADO Withdrew As Counsel By Request/Appointment Returned	70
Substitute Counsel Appointed	183
Final Disposition Reached	443
TOTAL	896

II. COURT OF APPEALS

Client Retained Own Counsel	4
Client Missing, Deceased	14
SADO Motion To Withdraw As Counsel Granted	228
Prosecutor's Motion To Dismiss Appeal Granted	2
Application For Delayed Appeal Denied	68
Confession Of Error By Prosecutor	2
Appeal Dismissed As Moot	7
Appeal Dismissed By Motion/Stipulation	1,042
Appeal Dismissed For Lack Of Progress	1
Final Disposition Reached	3,650
TOTAL	5,017

III. SUPREME COURT

SADO Removed As Counsel, Client Found Not Indigent	3
Withdrew As Counsel	5
Client Withdrew Appeal	3
Case Dismissed - Client Missing/Deceased	6
Appointment Vacated	32
Appeal Dismissed	14
Prosecutor's Leave Granted	43
SADO/Prosecutor Leave Granted/Denied	1,762
Disposition By Supreme Court On Plea Cases For Court Of Appeals	10
SADO Leave Granted - Client Retained Own Counsel	5
Final Disposition Reached	521
TOTAL	2,410

IV. UNITED STATES COURTS - DISTRICT/APPEALS/SUPREME

Writ Of Habeas Corpus Denied	9
Writ Of Certiorari By Prosecutor Granted/Denied	9
Substitute Counsel Appointed	1
Final Disposition Reached	18
TOTAL	37

TOTAL FINAL DISPOSITIONS	8,360

53962-1,2-4

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENT

to the

1985 Annual Report

of the

State Court Administrator — Michigan

The Constitution
State of Michigan
Article VI Sec. 11

"The state shall be divided into judicial circuits along county lines in each of which there shall be elected one or more circuit judges as provided by law. Sessions of the circuit court shall be held at least four times in each year in every county organized for judicial purposes. Each circuit judge shall hold court in the county or counties within the circuit in which he is elected, and in other circuits as may be provided by rules of the supreme court. The number of judges shall be changed and circuits shall be created, altered and discontinued on recommendation of the supreme court to reflect changes in judicial activity. No change in the number of judges or alteration or discontinuance of a circuit shall have the effect of removing a judge from office during his term."

Legend

1 - Circuit Number
(3) - Number Circuit Judgeships

Number of Circuit Courts	Judgeships	
55	167	December, 1985

CIRCUIT COURT

1985 Supplement to Annual Report

Table of Contents

NUMBER		PAGE
	Statewide Summary	1
	REGION I	
3	Wayne County	3
6	Oakland County	4
7	Genesee County	5
16	Macomb County	6
22	Washtenaw County	7
31	St. Clair County	8
38	Monroe County	9
	Recorder's Court	10
	Regional Summary	11
	REGION II	
1	Hillsdale County	12
2	Berrien County	13
4	Jackson County	14
5	Barry County	15
5	Eaton County	16
5	Court Summary	17
9	Kalamazoo County	18
14	Muskegon County	19
15	Branch County	20
17	Kent County	21
20	Ottawa County	22
30	Ingham County	23
36	Van Buren County	24
37	Calhoun County	25
39	Lenawee County	26
43	Cass County	27
44	Livingston County	28
45	St. Joseph County	29
48	Allegan County	30
	Regional Summary	31

CIRCUIT COURT

1985 Supplement to Annual Report

Table of Contents

NUMBER		PAGE
	REGION III	
8	Ionia County	32
8	Montcalm County	33
8	Court Summary	34
10	Saginaw County	35
18	Bay County	36
21	Isabella County	37
23	Iosco County	38
23	Oscoda County	39
23	Court Summary	40
24	Sanilac County	41
27	Newaygo County	42
27	Oceana County	43
27	Court Summary	44
29	Clinton County	45
29	Gratiot County	46
29	Court Summary	47
34	Arenac County	48
34	Ogemaw County	49
34	Roscommon County	50
34	Court Summary	51
35	Shiawassee County	52
40	Lapeer County	53
42	Midland County	54
49	Mecosta County	55
49	Osceola County	56
49	Court Summary	57
51	Lake County	58
51	Mason County	59
51	Court Summary	60
52	Huron County	61
54	Tuscola County	62
55	Clare County	63
55	Gladwin County	64
55	Court Summary	65
	Regional Summary	66

CIRCUIT COURT

1985 Supplement to Annual Report

Table of Contents

NUMBER		PAGE
	REGION IV	
11	Alger County	67
11	Luce County	68
11	Schoolcraft County	69
11	Court Summary	70
12	Baraga County	71
12	Houghton County	72
12	Keweenaw County	73
12	Court Summary	74
13	Antrim County	75
13	Grand Traverse County	76
13	Leelanau County	77
13	Court Summary	78
19	Benzie County	79
19	Manistee County	80
19	Court Summary	81
25	Marquette County	82
26	Alcona County	83
26	Alpena County	84
26	Montmorency County	85
26	Presque Isle County	86
26	Court Symmary	87
28	Missaukee County	88
28	Wexford County	89
28	Court Summary	90
32	Gogebic County	91
32	Ontonagon County	92
32	Court Summary	93
33	Charlevoix County	94
33	Emmet County	95
33	Court Summary	96
41	Dickinson County	97
41	Iron County	98
41	Menominee County	99
41	Court Summary	100
46	Crawford County	101
46	Kalkaska County	102
46	Otsego County	103
46	Court Summary	104

CIRCUIT COURT

1985 Supplement to Annual Report

Table of Contents

NUMBER		PAGE
	REGION IV	
47	Delta County	105
50	Chippewa County	106
50	Mackinac County	107
50	Court Summary	108
53	Cheboygan County	109
	Regional Summary	110

ANNUAL REPORT

Michigan Circuit Courts and Recorder's Court

Statewide Summary Of Annual Caseload

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

The statewide summary of annual circuit court caseload which follows is based on the Circuit Court Caseload Reports submitted to the State Court Administrator on a quarterly basis by circuit court and Recorder's Court officials pursuant to MCR 8.103(4).

All circuit courts submitted reports for the entire calendar year in 1985 for the first time since reporting began.

CIRCUIT COURT CASELOAD REPORT

Statewide Summary

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	APPEALS				DOMESTIC RELATIONS						GENERAL CIVIL	CIVIL DAMAGE SUIT		OTHER CIVIL	CRIMINAL		TOTAL
	Criminal	Civil	Agency	Other	Divorce No Child	Divorce W/Child	Paternity	Initiating URESA	Support	Other		Auto Neg.	Other		Capital	Non-Capital	
BEGINNING PENDING	789	1401	3843	766	14198	29342	8773	805	5836	3569	31177	14828	22817	793	2037	12233	153207
New Cases Filed	675	1076	6382	1980	22446	30351	13136	6288	14398	4155	25106	8756	14055	1187	4306	33874	188171
Re-Opened Cases	21	32	81	17	282	1336	2845	83	168	101	920	303	628	17	432	4468	11714
TOTAL CASELOAD	1485	2509	10306	2763	36926	61029	24754	7156	20402	7825	57203	23887	37500	1997	6775	50575	353092
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:																	
Jury Verdicts	1	0	0	1	0	0	72	0	0	0	213	163	317	2	892	1420	3081
Non-Jury Verdicts	4	2	20	11	484	1161	134	0	2	31	385	29	51	14	642	1631	4601
Guilty Pleas, Defaults, Uncontested, Settled	18	48	696	84	15355	19157	9058	678	3778	817	5655	1350	1587	244	2163	22686	83374
Removal/Transfers	196	120	76	14	19	64	13	267	6	51	2095	1222	2029	24	105	1503	7804
No Progress Dismissals	10	55	296	82	1157	2261	238	75	251	281	3938	1133	1391	135	0	3	11306
Non Service Dismissals	1	3	80	25	542	781	557	38	776	213	614	247	288	31	0	0	4196
Dismissals	239	405	1648	494	2210	4366	2117	338	2150	993	11474	6086	7906	401	601	6035	47463
Other Dispositions	256	527	3929	1221	2048	3501	5722	4945	8087	2016	2179	508	740	343	292	5646	41960
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	725	1160	6745	1932	21815	31291	17911	6341	15050	4402	26553	10738	14309	1194	4695	38924	203785
ENDING PENDING	760	1349	3561	831	15111	29738	6843	815	5352	3423	30650	13149	23191	803	2080	11651	149307
CASES PENDING OVER TWO YEARS	241	375	1012	263	2887	4251	975	32	341	1491	5082	2734	4740	144	18	331	24917

CIRCUIT COURT CASELOAD REPORT

Region 1 Circuit 3 Wayne County

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	APPEALS				DOMESTIC RELATIONS						GENERAL CIVIL	CIVIL DAMAGE SUIT		OTHER CIVIL	CRIMINAL		TOTAL
	Criminal	Civil	Agency	Other	Divorce No Child	Divorce W/Child	Paternity	Initiating URESA	Support	Other		Auto Neg.	Other		Capital	Non-Capital	
BEGINNING PENDING	235	710	1508	225	5093	7214	4461	8	3419	1729	12168	7260	11736	185	38	752	56741
New Cases Filed	60	394	1158	261	5153	6410	5192	1068	5013	1079	8981	3729	6673	295	386	2518	48370
Re-Opened Cases	0	10	10	0	59	156	2398	0	5	5	359	146	319	4	91	1168	4730
TOTAL CASELOAD	295	1114	2676	486	10305	13780	12051	1076	8437	2813	21508	11135	18728	484	515	4438	109841
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:																	
Jury Verdicts	1	0	0	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	49	23	85	0	87	148	444
Non-Jury Verdicts	1	1	0	0	132	318	58	0	0	0	22	5	13	0	55	115	720
Guilty Pleas, Defaults, Uncontested, Settled	3	0	0	0	3355	3346	4649	0	0	0	1608	632	736	49	183	1974	16535
Removal/Transfers	11	34	29	2	1	13	0	0	0	2	930	690	1209	6	13	79	3019
No Progress Dismissals	0	0	0	0	159	276	0	0	1	3	2643	912	1135	34	0	0	5163
Non Service Dismissals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dismissals	14	86	810	222	500	1194	909	0	942	266	4380	2560	3562	176	94	1065	16780
Other Dispositions	15	236	195	7	369	573	3835	1068	4634	958	168	117	260	0	29	468	12932
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	45	357	1034	231	4516	5720	9502	1068	5577	1229	9800	4939	7000	265	461	3849	55593
ENDING PENDING	250	757	1642	255	5789	8060	2549	8	2860	1584	11708	6196	11728	219	54	589	54248
CASES PENDING OVER TWO YEARS	176	321	854	199	2672	3541	710	0	264	1381	2240	1870	2798	79	4	32	17141

CIRCUIT COURT CASELOAD REPORT

Region 1 Circuit 6 Oakland County

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

	APPEALS				DOMESTIC RELATIONS						GENERAL CIVIL	CIVIL DAMAGE SUIT		OTHER CIVIL	CRIMINAL		TOTAL
	Criminal	Civil	Agency	Other	Divorce No Child	Divorce w/Child	Paternity	Initiating URESA	Support	Other		Auto Neg.	Other		Capital	Non-Capital	
BEGINNING PENDING	70	100	310	90	1095	1901	388	36	181	123	3801	1509	2735	65	180	1772	14356
New Cases Filed	99	175	783	935	3027	3473	710	404	516	282	3894	1122	2114	182	343	4926	22985
Re-Opened Cases	3	5	18	6	88	158	7	2	1	1	253	69	166	5	53	1117	1952
TOTAL CASELOAD	172	280	1111	1031	4210	5532	1105	442	698	406	7948	2700	5015	252	576	7815	39293
DISPOSITIONS RESULTING FROM:																	
Jury Verdicts	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	31	36	59	0	63	128	319
Non-Jury Verdicts	0	0	0	0	21	52	4	0	0	2	53	5	5	4	18	107	271
Guilty Pleas, Defaults, Uncontested, Settled	0	0	2	22	2335	2549	349	45	270	71	743	119	225	33	201	3271	10235
Removal/Transfers	18	19	16	7	2	5	5	244	5	19	517	204	365	7	12	94	1539
No Progress Dismissals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non Service Dismissals	0	0	44	6	74	97	37	0	35	8	128	39	69	2	0	0	539
Dismissals	55	100	125	64	507	673	102	32	70	85	2012	780	1265	41	33	642	6586
Other Dispositions	30	51	612	817	80	135	198	115	131	47	529	110	141	84	51	1732	4863
TOTAL DISPOSITIONS	103	170	799	916	3019	3511	697	436	511	232	4013	1293	2129	171	378	5974	24352
ENDING PENDING	69	110	312	115	1191	2021	408	6	187	174	3935	1407	2886	81	198	1841	14941
CASES PENDING OVER TWO YEARS	4	1	16	6	11	14	5	0	16	5	360	103	302	1	2	65	911